DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 614 HE 033 011

AUTHOR	Archer, Billie D. A.; Bailey, Jerry D.
TITLE	Kansas 1999 National Merit Semifinalists: A Profile and College/University Enrollment Choices.
INSTITUTION	Emporia State Univ., KS. Jones Inst. for Educational Excellence.
PUB DATE	2000-01-00
NOTE	83p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Jones Institute for Educational Excellence, The Teachers College, Campus Box 4036, 1200 Commercial St., Emporia, KS 66801-5087. Tel: 877-378-5433 (Toll Free); Fax: 316-341-5785.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academically Gifted; Age; Career Choice; Extracurricular Activities; Family Characteristics; High School Students; High Schools; Leadership; *Merit Scholarships; Race; Sex; State Surveys; Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; Student Employment; Travel
IDENTIFIERS	*Kansas; *National Merit Scholars

ABSTRACT

This report contains two studies. The first study was conducted in order to obtain a profile of Kansas students in the 1999 class of National Merit Semifinalists (NMSFs). A survey was mailed to 166 students. Data were analyzed in terms of age, gender, race, language, family characteristics, high schools attended, extracurricular activities, leadership roles, part-time work, travel experiences outside the United States, high school programs, judgments concerning their schools, college/university preferences, and career plans. Results indicate that: (1) the majority of Kansas NMSFs are males, and almost all are Caucasian Americans; (2) NMSF parents are usually stable and well educated; (3) 19 percent of the state's high schools produce all of the NMSFs; (4) NMSFs report frequent participation in extracurricular nonsport activities and some participation in extracurricular sports and community-based activities; (5) 86.3 percent of respondents have held high school leadership positions; (6) more than half hold part-time jobs during the school year; (7) about 60 percent have traveled outside of the United States; (8) 79 percent of respondents reported taking accelerated or Advanced Placement courses; (9) over 83 percent assigned their schools a grade of A or B; (10) 60 percent listed Kansas colleges and universities among the 3 institutions they would like to attend; (11) 47 percent had not made a career choice; and (12) only 19 percent listed Kansas as the state in which they would prefer to spend their careers. A follow-up study was completed to determine the colleges and universities where 1999 NMSFs planned to enroll in the fall. Information provided by school officials indicated that more than 42 percent enrolled in Kansas institutions, and a majority chose public institutions. Appendixes contain statistical data supporting the studies and a copy of the survey questionnaire. (Contains 10 references.) (EV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 448 614

KANSAS 1999 NATIONAL MERIT SEMIFINALISTS:

A PROFILE

AND

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY ENROLLMENT CHOICES

Two studies conducted by

Billie D. A. Archer and Jerry D. Bailey
Institute for Educational Research & Public Service
School of Education
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

for the

Jones Institute for Educational Excellence
The Teachers College
Emporia State University
Emporia, Kansas 66801

January 2000

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Pauls
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 033 011

KANSAS

1999 NATIONAL MERIT SEMIFINALISTS:

A PROFILE

A study conducted by

Billie D. A. Archer and Jerry D. Bailey
Institute for Educational Research & Public Service
School of Education
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

for the
Jones Institute for Educational Excellence
The Teachers College
Emporia State University
Emporia, Kansas 66801

January 2000

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in
Any form or by any means without the authors' written permission.

University Printing Services
Emporia State University
Emporia, Kansas
January 2000

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

- MERIT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM 1
- OTHER STUDIES OF KANSAS NMSFS 2
- STUDY PROCESS 3
- STATISTICAL OVERVIEW 3

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS 5

- AGE 5
- GENDER 5
- RACE 6
- LANGUAGE FLUENCY 6

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS 7

- PARENTS 7
- PARENTS' OCCUPATIONS 7
- PARENTS' EDUCATIONAL LEVELS 7
- FAMILY SIZE, SIBLINGS AND BIRTH ORDER 8
- ESTIMATED FAMILY INCOME 8

HIGH SCHOOLS ATTENDED 9

- PUBLIC/PRIVATE 9
- SIZE 9
- COST PER STUDENT 10
- LOCATION 10

EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES 12

- HIGH SCHOOL 12
  - *Academics* *12*
  - *Sports* *13*
- COMMUNITY 14

LEADERSHIP ROLES 15

PART-TIME WORK 16

TRAVEL EXPERIENCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES 17

HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS 17

- ACCELERATED/ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAMS 17
- COLLEGE CREDITS 18
- FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDIES 19
- GRADE POINT AVERAGES 20

JUDGMENTS CONCERNING SCHOOLS 20

- SCHOOL EVALUATIONS 20
- TEACHER EVALUATIONS 21
- ACADEMIC RIGOR 22
- LONGER SCHOOL YEAR 23
- HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC/NON-ACADEMIC FACILITIES 23
- PUBLIC SCHOOL CHALLENGES 24
- PUBLIC SCHOOL IMPROVEMENTS 25

Table of Contents

COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY CHOICE 26

- PREFERRED INSTITUTIONS 26
- REASONS UNDERLYING FIRST CHOICE 27
- FACTORS DETERMINING ACTUAL CHOICE 28

CAREER PLANS 28

- CAREER PREFERENCES 28
- WORK LOCATION PREFERENCE 29

SUMMARY 30

BIBLIOGRAPHY 32

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Kansas NMSFs by Sex and School Type	3
Table 2.	Completed Surveys Returned by Sex and School Type	4
Table 3.	Schools Attended by NMSFs and Schools Represented by Survey Responses	4
Table 4.	Comparison of 1999 and 1993 NMSFs	5
Table 5.	Language Comparison	6
Table 6.	Occupations of Mothers and Fathers	7
Table 7.	Parents' Highest Levels of Education	7
Table 8.	Family Size and Birth Order	8
Table 9.	Estimated Family Incomes for 1998-1999	8
Table 10.	Per Student Costs in Public School Districts Enrolling NMSFs	10
Table 11.	Public High Schools in the Five Counties Producing the Most NMSFs	11
Table 12.	Population 25 Years or Older in Nine Counties Producing the Most NMSFs	12
Table 13.	Participation in Extra-Curricular, Non-Sports Activities	12
Table 14.	Frequency of Participation in Extra-Curricular, Non-Sports Activities	13
Table 15.	Participation in Extra-Curricular Sports Activities	13
Table 16.	Frequency of Participation in Extra-Curricular Sports Activities	14
Table 17.	Participation in Community-Based Extra-Curricular Activities	14
Table 18.	Frequency of Participation in Community-Based, Extra-Curricular Activities	14
Table 19.	Types of Leadership Roles NMSFs Held in High School	15
Table 20.	NMSFs Frequency of Participation in High School Leadership Positions	16
Table 21.	Accelerated/Advanced Placement Courses Offered in High Schools Attended by NMSFs	17
Table 22.	Accelerated or Advanced Placement Courses Taken	18
Table 23.	College Credits Earned While in High School	19
Table 24.	Foreign Languages Studies	19
Table 25.	Grades Given Public & Private Schools by NMSFs	21
Table 26.	Grades Given Public & Private School Teachers by NMSFs	22
Table 27.	Above Average & Superior Grades Given to Public & Private School Teachers by NMSFs	22
Table 28.	Responses to Extending the School Year	23
Table 29.	Quality of Facilities and Equipment Available for Student Use	23
Table 30.	Ranking of Facilities Based on a Total of the Excellent and Good Ratings	24
Table 31.	Public School Challenges as Perceived by NMSFs	25
Table 32.	Recommendations for Improving Schools	25
Table 33.	Preferred Kansas Colleges/Universities	26
Table 34.	Preferred Non-Kansas Colleges/Universities	26
Table 35.	Reasons Underlying First Choice of College/University	27
Table 36.	Factors Determining Actual Choices of Colleges/Universities	28
Table 37.	Level of Certainty of Career Choices	29
Table 38.	Preferred States for Employment	30

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A. Percent of 11th Grade Males/Females Taking the PSAT/NMSQT 33

Appendix B. Kansas School Districts & High Schools Enrolling 1999 NMSFs 34

Appendix C1. Kansas Public High School Enrollments Including Those with NMSFs and Numbers of NMSFs 36

Appendix C2. Kansas Private High School Enrollments Including Those with NMSFs and Numbers of NMSFs 38

Appendix D1. Public High Schools Enrolling NMSFs Grouped by Size 39

Appendix D2. Private High Schools Enrolling NMSFs Grouped by Size 41

Appendix E. Cost Per Student in School Districts Enrolling NMSFs 42

Appendix F. County Data Describing Per Capita Income And Educational Level 44

Appendix G. 1999 NMSFs Judgments of Academic Rigor 47

Appendix H. Quality of Facilities and Equipment Available for Student Use Schools 48

Appendix I. 1999 NMSFs Recommendations for Improving Schools 50

Appendix J. 1999 NMSFs Career Choices 53

Appendix K. A Survey of Kansas High School Seniors Who have Achieved the Distinction of Becoming 1999 National Merit Semifinalists 55

INTRODUCTION

Merit Scholarship Program

One hundred seventy-two Kansas high school students in the class of 1999 were named National Merit Semifinalists (NMSFs) for the 1999 Merit Program. These students from across the state achieved this distinction by performing at an exceptionally high level on the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test/National Merit Semifinalist Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT) as high school juniors during the fall semester of 1997. This group represents 0.6 of 1% of Kansas' 28,000 seniors.

In September 1998, 16,163 high school students were designated as NMSFs by the National Merit Scholarship Corporation (NMSC) from the 1,211,429 students who entered the 1999 Merit Program by taking the PSAT/NMSQT in October 1997. The number of NMSFs named in each state is proportional to its percentage of the national total of high school graduates (NMSC Annual Report 1997-1998). While the scores for all NMSFs are extremely high, qualifying scores vary from state-to-state. The qualifying scores for the 1999 Merit Program range from 201 to 222. The qualifying score is 212 for 1999 NMSFs from Kansas, Arizona, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Washington. Nineteen states and the District of Columbia had higher qualifying scores while 26 states had lower qualifying scores. The qualifying scores are higher than those for the 1993 Merit Program when scores ranged from 180 to 204, with Kansas at 195.

A NMSF must achieve Finalist status to be eligible for a Merit Scholarship, a goal achieved by 90% of the NMSFs. The requirements to advance to Finalist status include consistently high academic performance in grades 9 through 12, an SAT score that confirms the PSAT/NMSQT performance, a strong recommendation from the high school principal, and submission of a scholarship application which provides detailed biographical, academic, and other information concerning the student.

The NMSC, a privately financed, not-for-profit organization operating since 1955, offered 7,320 Merit Scholarships in the 1998 Merit Program. These Merit Scholarships are distributed from three categories:

1. National Merit $2,000 Scholarships. These national awards are one-time, non-renewable scholarships that are distributed nationally using a representational formula similar to that applied to the NMSFs selection process. Every Finalist was considered for one of the 2,200 awards that were made in 1998.

2. Corporate-Sponsored Merit Scholarships. Three hundred twenty-four large and small companies, company foundations, and other business organizations sponsored 2,686 of these scholarships for Finalists who met criteria established by the sponsors. Most are reserved for children of sponsor organization employees. Some are one-time awards, but most are renewable for the undergraduate years. Scholarship awards range from $1,000 to $5,000 per year.

3. College-Sponsored Merit Scholarships. Two hundred two colleges and universities sponsored 4,073 awards in 1998. Two Kansas institutions offered a total of 74 awards as follows: Kansas State University-20 ($6,500 freshman year and $3,500 thereafter) and The University of Kansas-54 ($5,000 annually). Finalists must attend the sponsoring institution to receive the award that can be renewable for up to four years of undergraduate study.

NMSC Merit Scholarships have grown from approximately 500 in 1955 to more than 7,320 in 1998. It is important to note that 7,320 represents slightly more than half (51%) of the 14,329 who qualified as Finalists. Consequently, 49% of the Finalists do not receive scholarships from NMSC. Some of these may receive financial assistance from university or college scholarships that have not been reserved specifically for National Merit Scholarships. However, it is likely that some Finalists receive no scholarships. (The NMSC has no specific data concerning the Finalists who do not receive NMSC Merit Scholarships).

A major benefit that all National Merit Scholars enjoy is access to highly selective universities, if they can afford to attend them. For example, in 1998, the following five universities enrolled 944 Merit Scholars even though none offers College-Sponsored Merit Scholarships: Harvard-370, Stanford-201, Yale-146, Princeton-124, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology-103. This has been an upward trend since 1991 when these same five schools attracted 739 Finalists. (Note: Some of these students may have received National Merit or Corporate-Sponsored Merit Scholarships.)

Other Studies of Kansas NMSFs

There have been three previous studies of Kansas NMSFs. *The Wichita Eagle-Beacon* obtained the names of the 1,926 Kansas high school students who were named NMSFs from 1970 through 1980, 1,359 of whom were located by the newspaper. In a series of articles appearing during February 1986, under the general title of "The Kansas Brain Drain," the *Eagle-Beacon* reported where the NMSFs went to college (63% did their undergraduate work in Kansas, but for those who went on for graduate studies, 62% left Kansas). The series focused specifically on those who left Kansas to pursue their careers (nearly 60%), contrasting their reasons with those who remained in the state.

The second study was conducted by Carolyn Rampey, a staff member with the Kansas Legislative Research Department. Rampey sent letters and questionnaires to the 159 Kansas students who were NMSFs in 1985. She received responses from 102 (64.1%), all but one of whom were planning to go to college the next fall. Only 42% of the students were going to attend Kansas schools, a 21% drop from the average percentage reported by the *Wichita Eagle-Beacon* for the years 1970 through 1980. A similar study one year later showed an increase to 46% attending Kansas schools.

A third study was conducted by the Jones Institute for Educational Excellence at The Teachers College, Emporia State University (ESU), during the academic year 1992-93. The study was conducted over a four month period from late October 1992 through March 1993. It involved five stages: (1) exploring/inquiring, (2) designing/defining, (3) implementing/surveying, (4) analyzing/synthesizing, and (5) writing/reviewing.

Stage one: involved a literature search and contacts by telephone and/or letter with persons associated with the College Board, the Educational Testing Service, the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, and the Kansas State Department of Education. Also, an Emporia State University student who received a Merit Scholarship was interviewed during the exploratory process.

Stage two: resulted in the questionnaire "Survey of High School Seniors Who Are National Merit Semifinalists" that was approved for distribution by the ESU Institutional Review Board for Treatment of Human Subjects.

Stage three: was the mailing of the survey to the 169 Kansas NMSFs, addressed to each at his or her school. The initial mailing was on October 21, 1992. Two follow-up mailings occurred on November 18 and December 10, the last sent by certified mail. Surveys were completed anonymously except that each return envelope included a number to facilitate follow-up requests to those who had not responded. Also, the enrollment of the school that the student was attending was recorded on each returned survey to permit analyses based on school size.

Stage four: involved the compilation of the data with selected disaggregations to allow gender and school size comparisons.

Stage five: was the review of the investigator's draft report by other staff members in the Jones Institute for Educational Excellence.

Study Process

The current study is a replication of the 1993 Jones Institute for Educational Excellence study, and was conducted by staff at the Institute for Educational Research and Public Services at the School of Education, University of Kansas. The new study followed stages 2-5 of the original study (see Appendix K for survey instrument).

The initial mailing on November 6, 1998, was sent to 166 of the 172 NMSFs, addressed to each at his or her high school. The remaining six students could not be contacted through a high school because five received home schooling and one had left Kansas after taking the PSAT/NMSQT. A reminder postcard was sent on November 19, 1998, with a follow up letter sent on December 3, 1998. Follow up phone calls for all non-respondents were made to each student's high school counselor between December 14 and 18, 1998.

Statistical Overview

The following tables provide a statistical overview of the database that underlies this study.

Table 1. Kansas NMSFs by Sex and School Type

	Total NMSF		All NMSF Public		All NMSF Private	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Female	76	45.8%	68	46.3%	8	42.1%
Male	90	54.2%	79	53.7%	11	57.9%
TOTAL	166	100.0%	147	100.0%	19	100.0%

Three more Kansas students were named NMSFs in 1999 than in 1993. However, as mentioned, data from only 166 of the 172 students named 1999 NMSFs are analyzed because five NMSFs received home schooling and one NMSF left Kansas prior to the senior year of high school.

Using data for the remaining 166 NMSFs and as shown in Table 4, the number of female students increased by 14 while male students decreased by 17 when compared to the 1993 NMSFs. Numbers of females attending public schools increased by 16 while numbers of females attending private schools decreased by 2 when compared with the 1993 NMSFs. Numbers of males attending public schools decreased by 11 and numbers of males attending private schools decreased by 6 when compared with the 1993 NMSFs.

Table 2. Completed Surveys Returned by Sex and School Type			Responding NMSF Public		Responding NMSF Private	
	Total Respondents	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Female	50	52.6%	41	51.3%	7	58.3%
Male	45	47.4%	39	48.8%	5	41.7%
TOTAL	95	100.0%	80	100.0%	12	100.0%
			Missing responses = 2 female and 1 male			

A total of 95 NMSFs responded for a response rate of 57.2%. This compares to a 1993 response rate of 66.9%. One more female responded to the current survey than in the 1993 survey while 19 fewer males replied. Numbers of female respondents attending public schools increased by one and the number attending private schools decreased by two. Numbers of male respondents attending public schools decreased by 14 while the number attending private schools decreased by six.

Table 3. Schools Attended by NMSFs and Schools Represented by Survey Responses				
	Number of Schools Attended by All NMSFs	Percent	Number of Schools where 1+ NMSF Responded	Percent of Total Schools
Public	60	83.3%	47	78.3%
Private	12	16.7%	8	66.7%
TOTAL	72	100.0%	55	76.4%

Completed surveys were received from 80 NMSFs attending 47 public schools. Completed surveys were received from 12 NMSFs enrolled in 8 private schools. Three respondents did not indicate type of high school.

The following table provides descriptors of the 1999 NMSFs contrasted with the same data for the 1993 NMSFs. Sixteen females were named NMSFs in 1999, while male NMSFs decreased by 17 from those in 1993. A greater percent of young women returned the survey in both 1999 and 1993 than young men.

Table 4. Comparison of 1999 and 1993 NMSFs					
1999	All NMSFs	Public NMSFs	Private NMSFs	Surveys Returned	Response Rate
Female	76	68	8	50	65.8%
Male	90	79	11	45	50.0%
TOTAL	166	147	19	95	57.2%
1993					
Female	62	52	10	49	79.0%
Male	107	90	17	64	59.8%
TOTAL	169	142	27	113	66.9%

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Age

Kansas law requires a child to be at least six years old by September 1 to enter the first grade. This means that the typical high school student will be seventeen years or older as of September 1 of his or her senior year and is likely to graduate at the age of seventeen or eighteen.

As of December 31, the average age for young women was 17 years 8 months old compared to young men whose average age was 17 years 10 months. The 95 respondent ages ranged from 16 years 10 months to 18 years 7 months. As of June 1999, eleven young women and nine young men will still be 17 years old while one young woman and one young man each will have turned 19. All other respondents will be 18 years old.

The Class of 1999 appears to be slightly older than the Class of 1993, whose ages ranged from 16 years 4 months to 18 years 5 months. Further, 2 young men and 2 young women were still 16 years old upon graduation in June 1993 while all of the students in the Class of 1999 will be at least 17 years old upon graduation in June 1999.

While the survey did not ask about double promotions in K-12, the age data suggest that few, if any, of the NMSFs skipped grades. As will be noted when discussing High School Programs later in this report, some NMSFs will have a head start in college by accumulating college credits while in high school.

Gender

In Kansas, more young women (56.8%) took the PSAT/NMSQT in October 1997 than did young men (see Appendix A). However, more young men (90) were named NMSFs in September 1998 than were young women (76).

Race

Survey respondents identified themselves as follows:

	1999 Respondents		1993 Respondents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	87	93.5%	104	92.0%
Black	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Asian	2	2.2%	7	6.2%
American Indian	0	0.0%	2	1.8%
Hispanic	2	2.2%	0	0.0%
Other	2	2.2%	0	0.0%
Total	93	100.0%	113	100.0%
	N = 93; No Response = 2		N = 113	

According to the 1990 U.S. Census, racial distribution for the general population in Kansas was determined as follows:

Kansas 1990 U.S. Census	Total	Percent
White	2,233,897	88.5
Black	141,957	5.7
Asian & Pacific Islander	31,114	1.3
American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut	23,250	.9
Hispanic	90,289	3.6
	2,520,507	100.0

The serious under-representation of Blacks, American Indians, and Hispanics among the survey respondents continues to be a concern six years after surveying the 1993 Kansas NMSFs.

Language Fluency

In response to the question, "*Are you fluent in a language other than English?*," 9 young women and 3 young men answered "Yes". This is a reduction of three students from the 1993 study. Spanish was the only language reported by both sets of NMSFs students. The table below provides a comparison.

Table 5. Language Comparison

Language	1999	1993
Spanish	6	7
French		4
German	2	1
Mandarin Chinese	1	
Modern Hebrew	1	
Norwegian	1	
Taiwanese	1	
Korean		1
Latin		1
Signing Exact English		1
Total	12	15
1999 N = 95; 1993 N = 113		

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

Parents

The biological parents of 98.4% of the respondents are both living. Two fathers are deceased. Further, 89% (81 pairs) of the biological parents are still married to one another, with only 11% (10 pairs) divorced. (Three students did not respond to this item.) These data are similar to those reported by the Class of 1993.

Parents' Occupations

The occupations of the mothers and fathers are summarized as follows:

Table 6. Occupations of Mothers and Fathers

Mothers		Fathers	
Agriculture	1	Agriculture	7
Business	17	Business	20
Education	26	Education	11
Engineering	1	Engineering	8
Financial	3	Financial	1
Government	1	Government	4
Health/Medical	15	Health/Medical	12
Homemaker	15	Construction	2
Laborer	1	Laborer	4
Law/Law Enforcement	1	Law/Law Enforcement	6
Licensed Professional	2	Licensed Professional	1
Military	1	Military	1
Ministry	1	Ministry	2
Other	3	Other	1
Science	2	Science	3
Self Employed	1	Retired	1
Technology	1	Technology	8
No Response	3	No Response	3
	95		95

Parents' Educational Levels

The following table describes the highest levels of education that parents of NMSFs have completed.

Table 7. Parents' Highest Levels of Education

	Mothers		Fathers	
Level of Education	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Less than a high school diploma	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
High school graduate	4	4.2%	6	6.4%
College, but less than a degree	15	15.8%	7	7.4%
Associate (2 year) degree	2	2.1%	2	2.1%
Bachelor degree	41	43.2%	36	38.3%
Masters degree or higher	28	29.5%	25	26.6%

table continues

Table 7. Parents' Highest Levels of Education				
	Mothers		Fathers	
Other degrees:				
MD	2	2.1%	10	10.6%
JD	1	1.1%	3	3.2%
PhD	1	1.1%	4	4.3%
RN	1	1.1%	0	0.0%
Vocational Technical	0	0.0%	1	1.1%
TOTALS	95	100.0%	94	100.0%

All parents of the responding NMSFs completed high school. In 70 (73.7%) of the families, both parents received a bachelors or higher degree. In 35 (36.8%) of the families, the father attained a higher level of education; in 18 (18.9%), the mother; and in 40 (42.1%), both parents attained the same level of education.

Family Size, Siblings, and Birth Order

Two (2.0%) of the respondents have no siblings. Twenty-six NMSFs have brothers only, 32 have sisters only, and 35 have brothers and sisters. The table that follows shows the family sizes, frequencies, and birth order of the respondents.

Table 8. Family Size and Birth Order					
Number of			Birth Order		
Children	Families	Percent	Oldest	Middle	Youngest
1	2	2.1%	2	0	0
2	51	53.7%	33	0	18
3	18	18.9%	10	3	5
4	13	13.7%	6	3	4
5	4	4.2%	1	2	1
6	2	2.1%	1	1	0
7	2	2.1%	1	1	0
8	2	2.1%	2	0	0
12	1	1.1%	0	1	0

Sixty-nine of the respondents come from families that have two or three children. Among these 69, the NMSF is the older(est) in 43 cases. Overall, only children and first-borns represent approximately 60% of the survey respondents in 1993 and 1999.

Estimated Family Income

Estimated family incomes were reported by 91 of the 95 respondents as follows:

Table 9. Estimated Family Incomes for 1998-1999		
Income Range	Frequency	Percentage
Under $29,999	7	7.7%
$30,000-$49,999	17	18.7%
$50,000-$69,999	24	26.3%
$70,000-$89,999	12	13.2%
$90,000-$109,999	13	14.3%
$110,000 and over	18	19.8%

The three-year average (1995-1997) Kansas median income per household was $33,919 (U.S. Bureau of the Census).

HIGH SCHOOLS ATTENDED

Public/Private

There are 355 public high schools in Kansas operated by 304 Unified School Districts. Sixty of these 355 schools, located within 46 of the 304 districts, enroll 147 of the 166 NMSFs. There are also 23 private/parochial high schools in Kansas; 12 enroll the 19 remaining NMSFs. Appendix B lists these 72 different schools and the numbers of NMSFs enrolled in each.

Size

Public high school enrollments range from 16 to 2,158 students. The following is based on Kansas' public high school enrollment data in Appendix C1, including the 60 schools that enroll the 147 of the 1999 Kansas NMSFs.

- The total enrollment of the 168 smallest public high schools in Kansas is less than 20,000 students. Seven of these schools had one NMSF each. So, 47% of all the schools enrolled less than 5% of all 1999 NMSFs.
- The next 90 smallest public high schools enrolled about 25,000 students. These 90 schools represent about 25% of all Kansas high schools. Seven of these schools also had one 1999 NMSF each.
- Therefore, nearly 75% of the public high schools (258) enrolled less than 10% of the 1999 NMSFs. These small schools had less than one-third of all student enrollments.
- In contrast, 13 schools had student bodies greater than 1,600 and produced 57 NMSFs, or nearly 40%, of the 1999 NMSFs from public high schools.

Therefore, some big schools enrolled rather large numbers of NMSFs. The percentage of NMSFs from large schools was about the same in 1999 (38.8%) as it was in 1993 (40.1%).

Private high school enrollments range from 30 to 1,160 students. The following is based on Kansas private high school enrollment data in Appendix C2, including 12 private high schools which enroll the remaining 19 NMSFs.

- Fifteen (about 65%) of the private high schools enrolled a total of less than 3,000 students; four of these schools had five NMSFs. This is about 26% of the total 1999 NMSFs attending private high schools.
- Four (about 17%) of the private high schools enrolled a total of about 3,600 students. These four schools produced seven NMSFs. This is about 37% of the total 1999 NMSFs attending private high schools.
- Four of the private high schools with unknown enrollments produced 37% (7) of the NMSFs attending private high schools.

Appendix D includes enrollments for each of the 72 schools (public and private) enrolling one or more NMSF.

Cost Per Student

The costs per student in all public school districts that include NMSFs are summarized in the following table:

Table 10. Per Student Costs in Public School Districts Enrolling NMSFs

Costs	NMSFs	% of Total NMSFs
$4000-4500	27	18.4%
4501-5000	65	44.2%
5001-5500	30	20.4%
5501-6000	17	11.6%
6001-6500	3	2.0%
6501-7000	1	0.7%
7001-7500	3	2.0%
9001-9500	1	0.7%

Source: Kansas State Department of Education. 1997-98 School Year Legal General Fund/LOB/Budget per Pupil, by Veryl Peter, School Finance, Topeka, Kansas: KSDE 1999.

Most of the NMSFs are students in school districts that enroll young people who are *relatively* inexpensive to educate. That is, fewer "high cost" students enroll in those districts—students who are accommodated by the state school finance formula through weighting factors. These factors include sparsity, special needs, and socio-economic level. For example, a district would receive more money from the state to educate a student who is poor, has special needs, and is geographically isolated from the school than it would for a "normal" young person from a middle-class home located close to the school.

This does *not* imply that schools with fewer dollars do a better job and generate more NMSFs than those schools with more dollars. It also does *not* mean that school districts have an adequate resource base. Cost per student for each school district enrolling one or more 1999 NMSFs are presented in Appendix E.

Location

Twenty-eight high schools in five counties (Douglas, Johnson, McPherson, Sedgwick, and Shawnee) produced 60.8% of the NMSFs attending public schools. Four of these counties exceeds the state's average of 21.1% of adults over age 25 who have a bachelor's degree or higher. Douglas (37.7%) and Johnson (40.1%) are two of the three most highly educated of all counties, and together account for 36.7% of the NMSFs. Four additional counties produced four NMSFs each. Two of those counties were above the state's average of 21.1% of adults over age 25 who have a bachelor's degree or higher, and two below that average (see Appendix F for details). It is not surprising that schools that enroll large numbers of young people from homes with high levels of educational attainment have high-scoring students.

Table 11. Public High Schools in the Five Counties Producing the Most NMSFs		
County/High School	Enrollment 98-99	NMSFs
Douglas County		
Baldwin High School	414	3
Lawrence Free State High School	1163	5
Lawrence High School	1215	5
Total NMSFs		13
Johnson County		
Blue Valley	1459	5
Blue Valley North	1520	4
Blue Valley Northwest	1592	4
Gardner-Edgerton	632	1
Olathe East	1305	1
Shawnee Mission East	1972	16
Shawnee Mission North	1945	2
Shawnee Mission Northwest	1964	2
Shawnee Mission South	1872	10
Shawnee Mission West	1919	3
Total NMSFs		48
McPherson County		
Inman High School	248	1
McPherson High School	932	3
Moundridge High School	155	1
Total NMSFs		5
Sedgwick County		
Derby	2071	1
Maize	1373	1
Wichita East	2141	12
Wichita Heights	1398	2
Wichita North	1618	1
Wichita Northwest	1559	3
Wichita Southeast	1772	1
Wichita Northeast Magnet	469	3
Total NMSFs		24
Shawnee County		
Shawnee Heights	566	1
Topeka High School	2158	5
Topeka West High School	1221	4
Washburn Rural High School	1491	1
Total NMSFs		11
Source: Kansas State Department of Education. Enrollment by Grade, Race, and Gender from the Principal's Building Report [for each high school], School Year 1998-99. Retrieved March 1999 at http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us/k12/k12org.html.		

Nine counties representing 50% of the Kansas population age 25 and older produced 70% of the 1999 NMSFs. As shown in the following table, the three most populated counties among the nine represent 37.5% of the Kansas population and produced 50% of the 1999 NMSFs.

Table 12. Population 25 Years or Older in Nine Counties Producing the Most NMSFs				
County	Population ≥ 25	Population Rank	NMSF	NMSF Rank
Johnson	230,732	2	48	1
Sedgwick	252,868	1	24	2
Douglas	42,308	5	13	3
Shawnee	104,795	3	11	4
McPherson	8,001	37	5	5
Leavenworth	42,005	6	4	6
Reno	41,151	7	4	6
Riley	30,565	10	4	6
Cowley	23,837	12	4	6
TOTALS	776,262		117	
Source: Institute for Public Policy and Business Research. 1990 U.S. Census Data, *Statistics Kansas*, Volume 4.0 CD-ROM, June 1998. Lawrence, Kansas: The University of Kansas.				

EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

High School

This section summarizes responses of the 95 NMSFs who completed the 1999 survey. Attendance at a public or private high school was not considered when summarizing these data.

Academics

NMSFs participated frequently in extra-curricular, non-sport activites in high school. They averaged 4.61 activities per person. On average, young women participate in 5.06 activities, slightly more than young men at 4.11 activities. The next two tables detail these data.

Table 13. Participation in Extra-Curricular, Non-Sports Activities						
	Female Respondents		Male respondents		Response Rate	
Activity	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
School Paper	10	20.0%	7	15.6%	17	17.9%
Forensics	20	40.0%	12	26.7%	32	33.7%
Debate	12	24.0%	13	28.9%	25	26.3%
Choral Group	17	34.0%	12	26.7%	29	30.5%
Yearbook	7	14.0%	4	8.9%	11	11.6%
Theater/Plays	26	52.0%	16	35.6%	42	44.2%
Band	21	42.0%	19	42.2%	40	42.1%
Honor Society(ies)	46	92.0%	33	73.3%	79	83.2%
Student Government	17	34.0%	15	33.3%	32	33.7%
Student Clubs	33	66.0%	25	55.6%	58	61.1%
Orchestra	15	30.0%	8	17.8%	23	24.2%
Service Organizations	29	58.0%	21	46.7%	50	52.6%
Quiz Bowl	2	4.0%	2	4.4%	4	4.2%
Compiled from survey responses of 95 NMSFs attending public/private high schools.						

Students were very active in honor societies—over 80% participated in them. Nearly two in three also belonged to student clubs.

Table 14. Frequency of Participation in Extra-Curricular, Non-Sports Activities						
	Female Respondents		Male respondents		Total	
Frequency	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
0	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%
1	0	0.0%	5	11.1%	5	5.3%
2	3	6.0%	5	11.1%	8	8.4%
3	3	6.0%	6	13.3%	9	9.5%
4	12	24.0%	11	24.4%	23	24.2%
5	11	22.0%	6	13.3%	17	17.9%
6	10	20.0%	7	15.6%	17	17.9%
7	5	10.0%	2	4.4%	7	7.4%
8	3	6.0%	3	6.7%	6	6.3%
9	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.1%
	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%
Compiled from survey responses of 95 NMSFs attending public/private high schools.						

Only one student did not participate in any extra-curricular, non-sports activity; two students participated in nine activities each.

Sports

NMSFs averaged 1.49 extra-curricular sports activities per respondent with young men more active (1.67) than young women (1.34). The trend was true for varsity sports (1.22 for young men and 1.04 for young women) and for intramurals (.44 for young men and .30 for young women. As shown below, young men preferred the varsity sports of track, cross country, and football. Young women prefer the varsity sports of track, volleyball, cross country, and basketball.

Table 15. Participation in Extra-Curricular Sports Activities									
	Female Respondents			Male respondents			All Respondents		
Activity	Intramural	Varsity	Total	Intramural	Varsity	Total	Intramural	Varsity	Total
Basketball	5	7	12	6	5	11	11	12	23
Soccer	2	4	6	2	6	8	4	10	14
Tennis	1	6	7	2	6	8	3	12	15
Swimming	1	0	1	1	6	7	2	6	8
Football	1	0	1	2	7	9	3	7	10
Volleyball	1	11	12	0	0	0	1	11	12
Golf	0	2	2	4	2	6	4	4	8
Gymnastics	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Baseball	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Track	1	15	16	0	12	12	1	27	28
Cross Country	2	7	9	1	8	9	3	15	18
Wrestling	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3	4
Cheerleading	2	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	3
Softball	2	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	3
Frisbee Club	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Tae Kwon Do	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Totals	15	52	67	20	55	75	35	107	142
Compiled from survey responses of 95 NMSFs attending public/private high schools.									

Table 16. Frequency of Participation in Extra-Curricular Sports Activities						
	Female Respondents		Male Respondents		Total	
Frequency	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
0	12	24.0%	11	24.4%	23	24.2%
1	23	46.0%	18	40.0%	41	43.2%
2	13	26.0%	13	28.9%	26	27.4%
3	1	2.0%	3	6.7%	4	4.2%
4	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%
	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%
Compiled from survey responses of 95 NMSFs attending public/private high schools.						

Only one in four (24.2%) of the young people did not participate in sports.

Community

Most NMSFs (85.3%) participate in community-based activities, averaging 1.36 activities per person. Both young men and women participated at about the same rate. Nearly 6 in 10 were active in religious youth groups. The following tables detail the nature and frequency of 1999 NMSFs community involvement.

Table 17. Participation in Community-Based Extra-Curricular Activities						
	Female Respondents		Male respondents		Total	
Activity	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
4-H	4	8.0%	2	4.4%	6	6.3%
Scouting	4	8.0%	14	31.1%	18	18.9%
Religious Youth Groups	34	68.0%	22	48.9%	56	58.9%
Sports Programs	8	16.0%	13	28.9%	21	22.1%
Other	21	42.0%	7	15.6%	28	29.5%
Compiled from survey responses of 95 NMSFs attending public/private high schools.						

The category "Other" includes service to social service and community organizations, and local arts programs. Examples include Red Cross, LINK, Habitat for Humanity, United Way, DARE, the Social Service League, MS Society, Partners in Prevention of Teen Pregnancy, Project Teen Safe, Youth Action Coalition, shelters for the homeless and abused, local hospitals, public libraries, churches, youth symphony and orchestra, community and church choirs, comedy troupes, art projects, dance companies, community theater, and writers groups.

Table 18. Frequency of Participation in Community-Based, Extra-Curricular Activities						
	Female Respondents		Male Respondents		Total	
Frequency	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
0	4	8.0%	11	24.4%	15	15.8%
1	21	42.0%	16	35.6%	37	38.9%
2	10	20.0%	12	26.7%	22	23.2%
3	9	18.0%	6	13.3%	15	15.8%
4	4	8.0%	0	0.0%	4	4.2%
5	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.1%
	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%

Fifteen participated in no community-based activities.

LEADERSHIP ROLES

The following data have been summarized based on the responses of the 95 NMSFs who completed the survey. Attendance at a public or private high school was not considered when summarizing these data.

Most NMSFs (86.3%) have or have had leadership roles. Young women are more active in leadership than young men (3:2 ratio). The following tables detail the nature and frequency of 1999 NMSFs community involvement.

Table 19. Types of Leadership Roles NMSFs Held in High School

Leadership Role	Female	Male	Total	Leadership Role	Female	Male	Total
Student Council				**Musical Organizations**			
President	4	2	6	President	1	1	2
Vice President		1	1	Vice President	2		2
Secretary/Treasurer	5	3	8	Section Leader	6	10	16
Publicist	1		1	Drum Major	3		3
Representative	7	7	14	Master (Mistress)		3	3
TOTAL	17	13	30	Librarian	1		1
				TOTAL	13	14	27
Class Officers							
President	1	7	8	**National Forensics League**			
Vice President		2	2	President	2	1	3
Secretary/Treasurer	2	1	3	Vice President	2		2
Other officer	2		2	Secretary/Treasurer	1		1
TOTAL	5	10	15	Public Relations	1		1
				TOTAL	6	1	7
National Honor Society							
President	4	2	6	**Debate/Forensics**			
Vice President	2	1	3	President	1		1
Secretary/Treasurer	7		7	Captain	1		1
Committee Chair	2		2	Secretary/Treasurer	2		2
Parliamentarian	1		1	TOTAL	4	0	4
TOTAL	16	3	19				
				Publications			
Scholars/Quiz Bowl				Editor Newspaper	7	3	10
Captain	4	9	13	Editor Yearbook	4	1	5
TOTAL	4	9	13	Editor Literary Magazine	2		2
				TOTAL	13	4	17
Academic (Subject Matter) Clubs							
President	9	5	14	**Athletics**			
Vice President	1		1	Team Captain	12	5	15
Secretary/Treasurer	4	3	7	Cheerleading Captain	2		2
Other officer		1	1	Manager	1		1
Historian	1		1	TOTAL	13	5	18
TOTAL	15	9	24				

table continues

Table 19. Types of Leadership Roles NMSFs Held in High School							
Leadership Role	Female	Male	Total	Leadership Role	Female	Male	Total
Academics Competitive				**Theater**			
Captain		4	4	Assistant Director	1		1
Team Leader		1	1	Business Manager	1		1
Executive Board	1		1	State Manager	1		1
TOTAL	1	5	6	Choreographer	1		1
				Volunteer Coordinator	1		1
Civic Organizations				TOTAL	5	0	5
President	3	1	4				
Vice President	1	1	2				
Role Model/Ambassador	2	1	3				
Board Member	6		6				
Treasurer	2		2				
TOTAL	14	3	17				

Table 20. NMSFs Frequency of Participation in High School Leadership Positions						
	Female		Male		Total	
Frequency	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	5	10.0%	11	24.4%	16	16.8%
1	9	18.0%	13	28.9%	22	23.2%
2	9	18.0%	8	17.8%	17	17.9%
3	12	24.0%	6	13.3%	18	18.9%
4	8	16.0%	3	6.7%	11	11.6%
5	4	8.0%	2	4.4%	6	6.3%
6	2	4.0%	1	2.2%	3	3.2%
7	1	2.0%	1	2.2%	2	2.1%
	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%

NMSFs provide leadership within a wide variety of activities and organizations in their high schools and communities. Most (60%) held two or more such positions. A higher percentage of young men (16.8%) than young women (10.0%) report no leadership roles.

PART-TIME WORK

Slightly more than half (52.6%) of the 1999 NMSFs held part-time jobs during the school year. The percent is slightly higher for young men (55.6%) than for young women (50%). During their junior year, young women averaged 9.1 work hours per week; young men averaged 8.1. Average work hours increased to 10.6 for young women during their senior year and to 9.2 for young men. In the summer months, two of three students worked, up from one in two during the year.

NMSFs worked in a wide range of jobs including camp counselors, cashiers, cinema staff, clerks, child care providers, customer service representatives, fast food and restaurant staff, farmhands, life guards, maintenance personnel, musicians, production workers, sports officiators, and tutors/teachers. Some NMSFs held rather unique positions; examples include baker, dietary aide, graphic designer, webmaster, pharmaceutical lab assistant, and physics research assistant. The most frequently held jobs were in food service, tutoring, and child care. NMSFs held

a number of academic jobs. These include seven tutors (chemistry, trigonometry, mathematics, French, and Hebrew), five teachers (piano, viola, swimming, and shooting), a computer laboratory assistant, and a physics research assistant.

TRAVEL EXPERIENCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Approximately 60% (57) of the respondents noted that they had traveled outside the United States. Of these, 35 had traveled to Mexico and/or Canada, 28 to one or more European countries, and 15 to countries in the Caribbean, South America, Australia, and Asia. More young women (33) have traveled outside the United States than young men (24). Further, more young women (25) have traveled beyond Mexico or Canada than young men (13).

HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Accelerated/Advanced Placement Programs

This section provides data gathered in response to the following questions:

Does your high school offer accelerated or advanced placement courses? Yes/No
If "Yes," how many?
If "Yes," list those you will have completed by the time you graduate.

Advanced placement courses represent a specific and copyrighted pattern of instruction, while accelerated courses are less well defined and may take many forms. For example, some students describe regular courses as "honors" courses if students complete additional assignments. In other words, the term "accelerated" is probably subject to a variety of interpretations and might result in inconsistencies in responses.

Eighty (84.2%) of the 95 respondents indicated that accelerated or advanced placement courses were available in their schools. Fifteen (15.8%) students reported that these courses are not offered in their schools.

Table 21. Accelerated/Advanced Placement Courses Offered in High Schools Attended by NMSFs

Number AP/Accelerated Courses Available	Students Responding
1	2
2	6
3	5
4	4
5	4
5	1
7	1
8	2
9	2
10	7
11	1
12	1
13	1

table continues

Table 21. Accelerated/Advanced Placement Courses Offered in High Schools Attended by NMSFs	
Number AP/Accelerated Courses Available	Students Responding
14	3
15	4
18	1
19	1
20	3
27	3
28	1
36	1
Take courses, but do not know how many available	26

Of the 80 students reporting that their schools offered accelerated or advanced placement courses, five indicated that they did not take any of these courses. The number reported taken by students' ranges from one course to 17. Thirteen students reported enrolling in ten or more of these courses. Young women averaged 5.8 courses while young men averaged 6.1. The following table summarizes these data.

Table 22. Accelerated or Advanced Placement Courses Taken			
Number	Female	Male	Total
1	4	1	5
2	5	5	10
3	5	1	6
4	4	5	9
5	5	7	12
6	5	1	6
7	2	1	3
8	4	3	7
9	2	1	3
10	2	0	2
11	2	3	5
12	0	1	1
13	1	1	2
14	1	0	1
16	1	0	1
17	0	1	1
Totals	43	31	74

College Credits

This section gathers data from the question:

Does your high school provide opportunities to take college courses taught by college or university instructors?

Of the 95 respondents, 66 responded affirmatively. Fifty-six of those respondents indicated that they had taken such classes. These 56 respondents reported that they will have earned 2-48 college credit hours by the time they graduate from high school. Nine of the respondents will

have completed the equivalent of at least their college freshman year by the time they graduate from high school (see shaded area of table below). It is important to remember that these totals may represent advanced placement courses as well as college courses taught by community college or university instructors.

Table 23. College Credits Earned While in High School

Credits	Female	Male	Total
2	1	1	2
3	2	2	4
4	2		2
5	2	1	3
6	1	3	4
7	1		1
8		1	1
9	4	2	6
10	2	2	4
11	1	1	2
12	3	3	6
13	1		1
14			0
15	3	1	4
17	1		1
19		1	1
20	2	1	3
23	1	1	2
24	2		2
25		1	1
26		1	1
30	1	1	2
36	1		1
37	1		1
48		1	1
Totals	32	24	56
N = 50 females and 45 males			

Foreign Language Studies

All 95 respondents indicated that they had studied a foreign language while in high school. Twenty-two students reported studying two languages and three students reported studying three. The languages that the respondents studied are provided in the following table:

Table 24. Foreign Languages Studies

	Female	Male	Total
Chinese/French	1		1
French	9	6	15
French/German	3		3
French/Hebrew	1		

table continues

Table 24. Foreign Languages Studies			
	Female	Male	Total
French/Latin	3	2	5
French/Spanish/Latin	1		
German	6	10	16
German/Latin	1		1
German/Spanish	1	1	2
German/Spanish/Latin	1		1
Latin		1	1
Latin/Spanish	2	3	5
Russian/Spanish		1	1
Spanish	20	21	41
Spanish/French/American Sign Language	1		1
	50	45	95
N = 50 females and 45 males			

Forty students studied a foreign language for four or more years, 23 students for three years, 29 students for two years and 3 students for one year. These students appear to have diverse interests as demonstrated by their broad selection of foreign languages.

Grade Point Averages

Many schools use weighted grading formulae. This makes GPA comparisons difficult, if not impossible. The overall GPA was 4.05 on a 4.0 scale. Six students reported GPAs of less than 3.75; two of these had less than 3.0.

JUDGMENTS CONCERNING SCHOOLS

School Evaluations

The following survey question, adapted from the previous NMSF study, solicited students' evaluations about the schools they had attended:

Students are often given the grades A, B, C, D and F to denote the quality of their work. Suppose the schools that you have attended were graded in the same way. What grade would you give (check one for each school level)?

Elementary	___A ___B ___C ___D ___F
Middle/Junior High School	___A ___B ___C ___D ___F
High School	___A ___B ___C ___D ___F

The table that follows reports the grades assigned to elementary, middle, and high schools separately. Scores are categorized by public and private schools.

Table 25. Grades Given Public & Private Schools by NMSFs						
	Public		Private		Total	
	Response	Percent	Response	Percent	Response	Percent
Elementary						
A	50	60.2%	11	91.7%	61	64.2%
B	27	32.5%	1	8.3%	28	29.5%
C	6	7.2%	0	0.0%	6	6.3%
D	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
F	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Totals	83	100.0%	12	100.0%	95	100.0%
Middle						
A	18	21.7%	11	91.7%	29	30.5%
B	31	37.3%	1	8.3%	32	33.7%
C	25	30.1%	0	0.0%	25	26.3%
D	8	9.6%	0	0.0%	8	8.4%
F	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%
Totals	83	100.0%	12	100.0%	95	100.0%
High School						
A	46	55.4%	10	83.3%	56	58.9%
B	28	33.7%	2	16.7%	30	31.6%
C	6	7.2%	0	0.0%	6	6.3%
D	3	3.6%	0	0.0%	3	3.2%
F	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Totals	83	100.0%	12	100.0%	95	100.0%
Summary of all Ratings						
A	114	45.8%	32	88.9%	146	51.2%
B	86	34.5%	4	11.1%	90	31.6%
C	37	14.9%	0	0.0%	37	13.0%
D	11	4.4%	0	0.0%	11	3.9%
F	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Totals	249	100.0%	36	100.0%	285	100.0%

The grades show that NMSFs believe that their schools are doing well. Over 83% gave their schools As or Bs. Elementary schools got the highest grades, then high schools and middle schools. Even in the lowest ranked category—public middle schools—nearly 60% received As or Bs.

Teacher Evaluations

A similar survey question was asked about teachers with NMSFs responding to the following question:

> *Using the same scale again, what percent of teachers whom you have had at the various school levels would you give As, Bs, Cs, Ds, and Fs?*
> *Elementary Schools* %___A %___B %___C %___D %___F = 100%
> *Middle/Junior High School* %___A %___B %___C %___D %___F = 100%
> *High School* %___A %___B %___C %___D %___F = 100%

The following table includes the percentages of teachers in elementary, middle, and high schools that respondents believed deserved the designated grade. These data are reported by public and private schools. The percentages indicate that NMSFs view their elementary teachers as the best, with grades for middle school teachers more nearly average. The grades for high school teachers are better than middle school counterparts, but not up to the level of the elementary teachers. The percentages also indicate that NMSFs who attend private schools grade their teachers higher than those NMSFs who attend public schools.

Table 26. Grades Given Public & Private School Teachers by NMSFs

	Public			Private		
Grade	Elementary	Middle	High School	Elementary	Middle	High School
A	60.2%	37.9%	55.1%	80.4%	68.7%	72.0%
B	24.5%	32.4%	25.7%	13.3%	16.2%	12.1%
C	11.4%	21.2%	12.4%	3.3%	11.7%	13.8%
D	3.6%	7.1%	4.3%	2.9%	2.1%	1.2%
F	0.3%	1.4%	2.5%	0.1%	1.3%	0.9%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Private schools = 12 respondents; Public schools = 80 respondents; No response = 3						

NMSFs graded their elementary teachers highest, followed by high school then middle school teachers. It is important to note, however, that even with the lowest rated group of teachers (public middle school teachers), two of three (70.3%) received As or Bs.

Table 27. Above Average and Superior Grades Given to Public & Private School Teachers by NMSFs

	Public			Private			Total		
Grade	Elem	Mid	HS	Elem	Mid	HS	Elem	Mid	HS
A	60.2%	37.9%	55.1%	80.4%	68.7%	72.0%	70.3%	53.3%	63.6%
B	24.5%	32.4%	25.7%	13.3%	16.2%	12.1%	18.9%	24.3%	18.9%
	84.7%	70.3%	80.8%	93.7%	84.9%	84.1%	89.2%	77.6%	82.5%
Private schools = 12 respondents; Public schools = 80 respondents; No response = 3									

Academic Rigor

Students' education is affected by numerous factors including the school, the teachers, and academic rigor. The following question was posed to assess academic rigor at all levels of K-12 education:

> *As you reflect on your school experiences, how would you judge the academic rigor of your program?*

Fifty-seven of the respondents indicated that their academic programs should be less rigorous. Elementary and high school programs were judged as too rigorous while middle school programs were judged not rigorous enough. The summarized responses on academic rigor is included in Appendix G.

Longer School Year

The following survey question asked NMSFs about extending the school year:

In some nations, students attend school as many as 240 days a year as compared to about 180 days in the United States. How would you feel about extending the school year by 30 days, making the school year about 210 days or 10 months?

The responses to the survey are summarized as follows:

Table 28. Responses to Extending the School Year

	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Favor	14	28.0%	6	13.3%	20	21.1%
Oppose	22	44.0%	34	75.6%	56	58.9%
Uncertain	14	28.0%	5	11.1%	19	20.0%
Totals	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%
N = 50 females and 45 males						

Fifty-six of the 95 respondents opposed lengthening the school year. Young men tended to be more strongly opposed than young women. Two students chose to explain why they were uncertain: "It really depends on what we do with the time." "Depending on how breaks are done—should not be all at one time."

High School Academic/Non-Academic Facilities

NMSFs were asked to rate academic and non-academic facilities available for student use in their high schools. The following table reports the percentages of the responses to each of 15 different items.

Table 29. Quality of Facilities and Equipment Available for Student Use

Academic Facilities	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable/ Available
Library	14.7%	49.5%	26.3%	9.5%	0.0%
Science Laboratory(ies)	12.6%	45.3%	32.6%	6.3%	3.2%
Classrooms	11.6%	57.9%	27.4%	3.2%	0.0%
Band/Orchestra Room	12.6%	29.5%	26.3%	5.3%	26.3%
Choral Room	11.6%	25.3%	17.9%	2.1%	43.2%
Auditorium/Theater	26.3%	42.1%	10.5%	9.5%	11.6%
Vocational Laboratories/Classrooms	7.4%	20.0%	9.5%	2.1%	61.1%
Computers	29.5%	35.8%	25.3%	6.3%	3.2%
TOTAL AVERAGE OF PERCENTS	15.8%	38.2%	22.0%	5.5%	18.6%
Non-Academic Facilities					
Gymnasium	34.7%	49.5%	9.5%	3.2%	3.2%
Swimming Pool	8.4%	23.2%	5.3%	6.3%	56.8%
Football Field	16.8%	22.1%	10.5%	9.5%	41.1%
Baseball Field	10.5%	13.7%	10.5%	4.2%	61.1%
Soccer Field	5.3%	14.7%	8.4%	5.3%	66.3%
Track Field	17.9%	33.7%	10.5%	10.5%	27.4%
Tennis Courts	8.4%	24.2%	16.8%	6.3%	44.2%
TOTAL AVERAGE OF PERCENTS	14.6%	25.9%	10.2%	6.5%	42.9%
N = 95 attending 55 public & private schools					

Libraries, science labs, classrooms, auditoriums, and computers were judged to be excellent or good by more than half of the respondents. The table below provides a ranking for the 15 items based upon the percentage ratings at the excellent and good levels given by the 95 respondents.

Table 30. Ranking of Facilities Based on a Total of the Excellent and Good Ratings	
Gymnasium	84.2%
Classrooms	69.5%
Auditorium/Theater	68.4%
Computers	65.3%
Library	64.2%
Science Laboratory(ies)	57.9%
Track Field	51.6%
Band/Orchestra Room	42.1%
Football Field	38.9%
Choral Room	36.8%
Tennis Courts	32.6%
Swimming Pool	31.6%
Vocational Laboratories/Classrooms	27.4%
Baseball Field	24.2%
Soccer Field	20.0%

In an effort to determine if school size is related to these judgments, the data were disaggregated to compare respondents evaluations based on three school enrollment sizes: 18 schools enrolling up to 400 students, 29 schools enrolling 401 to 1,599 students, and 8 schools enrolling 1,600 or more students. The results of the disaggregation can be found in Appendix H.

A review of the total percentages for the eight academic facilities reveals little difference between the ratings for the three size groups. Further, the total percentages confirmed the overall response that libraries, science labs, classrooms, auditoriums, and computers were judged excellent or good by more than half of the respondents regardless of the population of the school that they attended. The contrast between the three size groups was greater for the seven non-academic facilities. Only 37% of the NMSFs from small schools and 37.8% of those from medium-sized schools thought these facilities were excellent or good. Nearly half (48.6%) of those from large schools rated these facilities excellent or good.

Public School Challenges

The following question, taken from the 1998 Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa Poll, was asked:

What do you think are the biggest problems that the schools in your community face?

The most frequently cited problem in the Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa Poll was "fighting/violence/ gangs" listed by 15% of the respondents. The next three in order of frequency were "Lack of discipline" (14%), "Lack of financial support/funding/money" (12%), and "Use of drugs/dope" (10%). These issues continue as challenges for Kansas schools according to the 1999 NMSFs respondents, but not at the same levels indicated in the Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa Poll.

The 95 respondents offered 111 answers to this question. A perceived lack of funding (24.3%) was the most frequent response, followed by student apathy (18%). Both concerns have increased in importance since the 1993 survey. The following table provides the categorization of responses and the frequency of citation.

Table 31. Public School Challenges as Perceived by NMSFs

Category	Frequency	Percent
Finance/Overcrowding		
• Funding	27	24.3%
• Technology and facilities	3	2.7%
• Overcrowding	3	2.7%
Students		
• Student apathy	20	18.0%
• Drugs, tobacco and/or alcohol use and abuse	9	8.1%
• Violence	5	4.5%
Community/Family Involvement	5	4.5%
Curriculum/Grouping	4	3.6%
Inadequate Teachers	4	3.6%
Standards	6	5.4%
Administration	2	1.8%
Values	2	1.8%
Various other items	21	18.9%
TOTAL	111	100%

Public School Improvements

Ninety-one of the 95 students responded to the following question:

If you were allowed to make only one recommendation for improving the schools, what would that recommendation be?

The table below lists the categories for the recommendations made and the frequency for each.

Table 32. Recommendations for Improving Schools

	Responses	Percent
Academics and Curriculum	34	37.3%
Facilities and Equipment	17	18.7%
Teachers' Salaries & Working Conditions	9	9.9%
Organizational Changes	9	9.9%
Discipline	4	4.4%
Athletics	2	2.2%
Other	16	17.6%
Total Responses	91	100.0%

Interestingly, respondents made the most suggestions for improving schools in the area of academics and curriculum. This may point to an inconsistency in the results. Earlier, the

NMSFs reported that academics were too rigorous at the high school level. This difference needs more research to determine the specific reasons for this inconsistency. All recommendations submitted by the 95 respondents to the survey are included in Appendix I.

COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY CHOICE

Preferred Institutions

Fifty-seven of the 95 respondents listed Kansas colleges and universities among the institutions they would like to attend. Young men (30) expressed slightly more interest in Kansas institutions than did young women (27). The choices listed by the 1999 respondents are reported in the following table. Some students listed more than one Kansas institution. Thirty-eight of the 1999 NMSF respondents did not list any Kansas institutions among the colleges or universities they would like to attend.

Table 33. Preferred Kansas Colleges/Universities

	1st Choice		2nd Choice		3rd Choice		Total		Grand
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
A Kansas institution	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
University of Kansas	8	11	5	6	8	4	21	21	42
Wichita State University	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	3
Kansas State University	5	6	3	4	4	3	12	13	25
Piftsburg State University	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3
Ft. Hays State University	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2
Emporia State University	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Colby Community College	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Bethel College	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
Baker University	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
Totals	14	18	9	14	14	13	37	45	82

Eighty-seven non-Kansas institutions were listed among the three choices of preferred colleges and universities. Forty-nine of these were selected only once; 22 were listed twice. The table below describes the remaining 16 that were selected three or more times.

Table 34. Preferred Non-Kansas Colleges/Universities

	1st Choice		2nd Choice		3rd Choice		Total		Grand
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
California Institute of Technology	0	2	1	2	0	1	1	5	6
Duke	4	0	3	1	0	3	7	4	11
Harvard	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	3	4
Iowa State University	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	4	5
Macalester College	0	1	2	0	1	0	3	1	4
Massachusetts Inst. of Technology	0	2	1	2	0	3	1	7	8
Northwestern University	2	2	4	1	2	0	8	3	11
Oklahoma State University	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	3
Stanford	2	1	0	1	3	0	5	2	7
Truman State University	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	3
University of California Berkeley	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	3
University of Chicago	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	4

table continues

Table 34. Preferred Non-Kansas Colleges/Universities									
	1st Choice		2nd Choice		3rd Choice		Total		Grand
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	Total
University of Illinois Urbana	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3
University of Minnesota	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	3
University of Southern California	1	0	1	1	1	0	3	1	4
Washington University in St. Louis	3	3	1	0	2	1	6	4	10
Yale	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3
Totals	16	16	20	17	11	12	47	45	92

Reasons Underlying First Choice

Students were asked to review a list of 13 reasons for preferring an institution and to check all that applied to their first choice of a college or university. The results are shown in the following table:

Table 35. Reasons Underlying First Choice of College/University						
	Female		Male		Total	
Reason	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Good academic reputation	48	96.0%	45	100.0%	93	97.9%
Size	37	74.0%	26	57.8%	63	66.3%
Promise of financial aid or scholarship	29	58.0%	33	73.3%	62	65.3%
Graduates get good jobs	30	60.0%	27	60.0%	57	60.0%
Graduates go to top graduate schools	25	50.0%	18	40.0%	43	45.3%
Near home	17	34.0%	17	37.8%	34	35.8%
Good social life reputation	12	24.0%	21	46.7%	33	34.7%
Low tuition	14	28.0%	14	31.1%	28	29.5%
Guidance counselors' advice	15	30.0%	8	17.8%	23	24.2%
Relatives' wishes	13	26.0%	8	17.8%	21	22.1%
Teachers' advice	10	20.0%	8	17.8%	18	18.9%
Friends' suggestions	11	22.0%	7	15.6%	18	18.9%
Reputation in sports	6	12.0%	12	26.7%	18	18.9%
Religious affiliation	3	6.0%	6	13.3%	9	9.5%
Other	13	26.0%	10	22.2%	23	24.2%

Comments provided in the category "Other" included "not too close to home," "am currently attending," "diverse, relaxed and the students loved the school," "honor system," familiarity with faculty and campus," "desired program of study," "big honors program," "good vibes," "relatives currently attending school," "good music," "excellent instructors," "varsity swimming," "good research facilities and opportunities," "diversity of student body," "computer arts availability," "marching band large," and "skiing and fishing."

Over 90% of the 1999 respondents reported that "good academic reputation" was the number one reason underlying first choice of a college or university. The next 3 reasons were "size," promise of financial aid/scholarship," and "graduates get good jobs." Reasons underlying first choice of a college or university differed between the genders.

Factors Determining Actual Choice

In addition to identifying the reasons underlying first choices of a college or university, NMSFs were asked to list the factors *that will determine* the college or university they actually attend. As the following table indicates, financial considerations become dominant, listed by more than three out of four of the NMSFs.

Table 36. Factor Determining Actual Choices of Colleges/Universities

	Female		Male		Total	
Factor Description	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Financial						
Aid/Scholarships	26		23		49	
Cost/ Affordability	6		9		15	
Money	2		4		6	
	34	68.0%	36	80.0%	70	73.7%
Acceptance/Admission	15	30.0%	8	17.8%	23	24.2%
Academic Reputation	10	20.0%	8	17.8%	18	18.9%
Location						
Location	3		4		7	
Distance from Home	4		4		8	
	7	14.0%	8	17.8%	15	15.8%
Program Availability	12	24.0%	5	11.1%	17	17.9%
Size	2	4.0%	2	4.4%	4	4.2%
Campus 'Feel'/Atmosphere	4	8.0%	6	13.3%	10	10.5%
Other						
Campus Visit	4	8.0%	0		4	4.2%
Desire to Attend There	2	4.0%	2	4.4%	4	4.2%
Parents' Desire	2	4.0%	1	2.2%	3	3.2%
Sports	0		3	6.7%	3	3.2%
Extra-Curricular/Research Opportunities	1	2.0%	2	4.4%	3	3.2%
Faculty Involvement	1	2.0%	1	2.2%	2	2.1%
College Interest in Candidate	2	4.0%	0		2	2.1%
Graduate Job Placement	1	2.0%	1	2.2%	2	2.1%
Need to Leave Home	1	2.0%	0		1	1.1%
Unknown	0		2	4.4%	2	2.1%
Other	2	4.0%	1	2.2%	3	3.2%

The above factors determining actual choice of a college or a university are comparable to the responses of the 1993 NMSFs.

CAREER PLANS

Career Preferences

The results reported in this section are provided with a note of caution. Well over half of all college students change their majors at least once (Astin, 1977). Given that the respondents are high school seniors, they were asked to respond to the following question:

Have you made a career choice?

Fifty of 1999 NMSFs respondents said "Yes" and 45 said "No." More young men (27) than young women (23) responded "Yes." However, when asked about the certainty of their career choice, young women were more certain than young men.

Table 37. Level of Certainty of Career Choices

	Female		Male		Total	
Certainty Level	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 (very certain)	3	13.0%	1	3.7%	4	8.0%
2	14	60.9%	11	40.7%	25	50.0%
3	4	17.4%	8	29.6%	12	24.0%
4	1	4.3%	4	14.8%	5	10.0%
5 (very uncertain)	1	4.3%	3	11.1%	4	8.0%

The career preferences of the 50 students who listed choices are in Appendix J. Young women chose careers in science-related fields more frequently than young men, as summarized below. However, young men continue to choose engineering as a career slightly more often than young women when compared to the 1993 NMSF Survey.

	Female	Male
Engineering	21.7%	25.9%
Health and Medical Science	30.4%	11.1%
Science and Mathematics	8.7%	7.4%
	60.9%	44.4%

Young men more frequently selected careers in the fields listed in the table below. Over 4% of the young women indicated a choice of business-related careers where none chose this option during the 1993 NMSF Survey. Further, only young men listed careers in humanities and social sciences in the 1999 study, while both young men and young women noted an interest in these fields in the earlier study.

	Female	Male
Business	4.3%	14.8%
Humanities and Social Sciences	0.0%	11.1%
Fine and Applied Arts	8.7%	11.1%
Education	4.3%	7.4%
	39.0%	70.3%

Work Location Preference

The following table summarizes the responses to the question:

After you graduate from college, where (which state) would you most prefer to work?

Table 38. Preferred States for Employment			
	Females	Males	Total
Kansas	8	10	18
New York	3	3	6
Illinois	2	3	5
California	2	2	4
Florida	1	2	3
Massachusetts	3	0	3
North Carolina	2	1	3
Washington	1	2	3
Minnesota	1	1	2
Arizona	1	0	1
Colorado	1	0	1
Iowa	0	1	1
Maine	1	0	1
Montana	1	0	1
South Dakota	1	0	1
Texas	0	1	1
Midwest	0	2	2
West Coast	0	1	1
Warm State	0	1	1
British Columbia, Canada	0	1	1
Norway	0	1	1
No Preference/Not Important	1	1	2
Unknown	19	11	30
Where I go to college	1	0	1
Total Responses	49	44	93
N=87 (48 females & 39 males); some respondents indicated more than one choice			

Less than one out of five (18.9%) of the respondents listed Kansas as the state in which they would prefer to work. An additional 33.7% of the respondents reported that they were uncertain, had no preference, or believed that the state in which they work was not important.

SUMMARY

Ninety-five of 166 Kansas seniors named 1999 NMSFs responded to the survey during the fall of 1998. Fifty of those respondents were young women and 45 were young men. The 95 respondents attended 47 public high schools located in 40 school districts, and 8 private high schools. The following general characteristics of the 1999 Kansas NMSFs result from the compilation of their collective responses.

Personal Characteristics. The NMSFs graduating in May 1999 already are or soon will be 18 years of age. Young women and men are almost equally represented. Most of these students are white. One of every 8 students is fluent in a language other than English. Approximately half of these students will have traveled outside of the U.S. at least once prior to graduation from high school.

Family Characteristics. The 1999 NMSFs are members of educated, nuclear families. Their parents have high school diplomas and most have bachelor's degrees. Further, the NMSFs live with both parents and, in most cases, at least one sibling. Estimated family incomes for most NMSFs are well above the Kansas per capita income.

High Schools Attended. The majority of the 1999 NMSFs attended Kansas public high schools. Also, more of these students attend high schools with large enrollments in urban areas than smaller schools in rural areas. Enrollment of NMSFs in private high schools remained similar to the 1993 level. However, five Kansas students receiving home schooling were named 1999 NMSFs.

Academic Activities. NMSFs rate their teachers highly and indicate that their academic programs are rigorous. Most NMSFs participate in advanced or accelerated classes during high school. Some of these students will begin their post-secondary education with college credits equivalent to the completion of their freshman year of school.

Extra-Curricular Activities. NMSFs are equally active outside of the classroom, developing technical and interpersonal communication skills. Activities range from writing for the student newspaper and organizing student clubs; developing appreciation for or talent in the arts; developing fitness and skill in sports such as track, basketball, and volleyball; to giving back to their community through service. Development of leadership skills is the common thread that connects all of these activities. These NMSFs average over five activities per person. Furthermore, over half of these students hold part-time employment during the school year, and one in two hold employment during the summer months.

College & Career Plans. Slightly more than half of the highly talented Kansas NMSFs include consideration of a Kansas institution among their top three choices of a college or university. They indicated that their final choice will be based on four factors: 1) good academic reputation, 2) size, 3) financial aid or scholarship assistance, and 4) graduates get good jobs. Over half of the NMSFs will have decided upon a career choice when they begin college. However, less than one out of five indicated Kansas as the state in which they would prefer to work upon graduation.

The 1999 Kansas NMSFs represent a well-educated, family-oriented, highly active group of young people. Their development as leaders is demonstrated by their recommendations on improving schools (see Appendix I). Their families have provided them with strong foundations and educational opportunities. Our job as educators is to extend those opportunities through talented teachers and excellent facilities at both K-12 and post-secondary education levels.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Astin, A. W. *Four Critical Years*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

College Board. *PSAT/NMSQT Summary Report (Kansas) for College-Bound Juniors.*, 1984 through 1998. New York: The College Board.

Institute for Public Policy and Business Research. 1990 U.S. Census Data, *Statistics Kansas*, Volume 4.0 CD-ROM, June 1998. Lawrence, Kansas: The University of Kansas.

Institute for Public Policy and Business Research. 1996 Per Capita Data by Kansas County. Retrieved at http://www.ukans.edu/cwis/units/IPPBR/ksdata/esum/report/, May 1999.

Kansas State Department of Education. *Kansas Educational Directory 1998-1999*. Topeka, Kansas: KSDE.

Kansas State Department of Education. Enrollment by Grade, Race, and Gender from the Principal's Building Report [for each high school], School Year 1998-99. Retrieved March 1999 at http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us/k12/k12org.html.

Kansas State Department of Education. 1997-98 School Year Legal General Fund/LOB/Budget per Pupil, by Veryl Peter, School Finance, Topeka, Kansas: KSDE 1999.

National Merit Scholarship Corporation. *Annual Report 1997-98*. Evanston, Illinois: National Merit Scholarship Corporation.

National Merit Scholarship Corporation. *The Guide to the National Merit Scholarship Program*. September 1998. Evanston, Illinois: National Merit Scholarship Corporation.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. March (1999) Current Population Survey. Retrieved May 1999 at http://www.census.gov/hhes/income/income97/in97med.html.

APPENDIX A

Percent of 11th Grade Males/Females Taking the PSAT/NMSQT

	National		Kansas	
Year	Male	Female	Male	Female
1998	44.1	55.9	42.7	57.3
1997	43.8	56.2	43.2	56.8
1996	43.9	56.1	44.7	55.3
1995	43.7	56.3	44.1	55.9
1994	43.9	56.1	43.1	56.9
1993	43.9	56.1	44.4	55.6
1992	44.2	55.8	44.1	55.9
1991	44.7	55.3	44.3	55.7
1990	44.9	55.1	44.0	56.0
1989	45.1	54.9	44.5	55.5
1988	45.2	54.8	44.8	55.2
1987	45.2	54.8	45.5	54.5
1986	45.3	54.7	45.5	54.5
1985	45.5	54.5	44.7	55.3
1984	45.7	54.3	44.6	55.4

Source: College Board. *PSAT/NMSQT Summary Report (Kansas) for College-Bound Juniors*, 1984-1998.

APPENDIX B

Kansas School Districts & High Schools Enrolling 1999 NMSFs

Unified School District	County	High School	# of NMSFs
104 White Rock	Jewell	White Rock	1
226 Meade	Meade	Meade	1
229 Blue Valley	Johnson	Blue Valley	5
		Blue Valley North	4
		Blue Valley Northwest	4
231 Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch	Johnson	Gardner-Edgerton	1
233 Olathe	Johnson	Olathe East	1
235 Uniontown	Bourbon	Uniontown	1
250 Pittsburg	Crawford	Pittsburg	1
253 Emporia	Lyon	Emporia	1
259 Wichita	Sedgwick	Wichita East	12
		Wichita Heights	2
		Wichita North	1
		Wichita Northwest	3
		Wichita Southeast	1
		Wichita Northeast Magnet	3
260 Derby	Sedgwick	Derby	1
266 Maize	Sedgwick	Maize	1
290 Ottawa	Franklin	Ottawa	1
305 Salina	Saline	Salina Central	2
		Salina South	1
308 Hutchinson	Reno	Hutchinson	4
324 Eastern Heights	Phillips	Eastern Heights	1
329 Mill Creek Valley	Wabaunsee	Wabunsee	1
333 Concordia	Cloud	Concordia	2
348 Baldwin	Douglas	Baldwin	3
357 Belle Plain	Sumner	Belle Plain	1
365 Garnett	Anderson	Anderson County	1
373 Newton	Harvey	Newton	1
379 Clay Center	Clay	Clay Center	1
382 Pratt	Pratt	Pratt	1
383 Manhattan	Riley	Manhattan	4
406 Wathena	Doniphan	Wathena	1
409 Lyons	Rice	Lyons	1
413 Chanute	Neosho	Chanute	1
415 Hiawatha	Brown	Hiawatha	1
418 McPherson	McPherson	McPherson	3
423 Moundridge	McPherson	Moundridge	1
428 Great Bend	Bartton	Great Bend	1
437 Auburn-Washburn	Shawnee	Washburn Rural	1
441 Sabetha	Nemaha	Sabetha	1

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Kansas School Districts & High Schools Enrolling 1999 NMSFs

Unified School District	County	High School	# of NMSFs
443 Dodge City	Ford	Dodge City	1
448 Inman	McPherson	Inman	1
450 Shawnee Heights	Shawnee	Shawnee Heights	1
453 Leavenworth	Leavenworth	Leavenworth	2
460 Hesston	Harvey	Hesston	1
465 Winfield	Cowley	Winfield	4
469 Lansing	Leavenworth	Lansing	2
475 Geary County	Geary	Junction City	1
483 Kismet-Plains	Seward	Southwestern Heights	1
489 Hays	Ellis	Hays	2
497 Lawrence	Douglas	Lawrence High	5
		Free State	5
501 Topeka	Shawnee	Topeka High	5
		Topeka West	4
512 Shawnee Mission	Johnson	Shawnee Mission East	16
		Shawnee Mission North	2
		Shawnee Mission Northwest	2
		Shawnee Mission South	10
		Shawnee Mission West	3
Forty-six (46) USDs	**Sixty (60) High Schools**		**147**

Private Schools Enrolling 1999 NMSFs
(and USDs with which they are geographically associated)

Unified School District	County	High School	# of NMSFs
229 Blue Valley	Johnson	Hyman Brand Hebrew	1
	Johnson	St. Thomas Aquinas	1
259 Wichita	Sedgwick	Bishop Carroll	2
	Sedgwick	Independent School	2
	Sedgwick	Kapaun-Mount Carmel	3
	Sedgwick	Sunrise Christian Academy	1
	Sedgwick	Trinity Academy	1
	Sedgwick	Wichita Collegiate	3
409 Atchison	Atchison	Maur Hill Prep	1
453 Leavenworth	Leavenworth	Immaculata	1
501 Topeka	Shawnee	Cair-Paravel Latin	2
512 Shawnee Mission	Johnson	Bishop Miege	1
	Twelve (12) High Schools		**19**

APPENDIX C1

Kansas Public High School Enrollments
Including Those with NMSFs and Numbers of NMSFs

School Size	# of Students	Percent	# of Schools	Percent	With NMSFs	Percent	# of NMSFs	Percent
0-50	314		9		0		0	
51-100	4,431		58		2		2	
101-150	6,262		51		2		2	
151-200	8,717		50		3		3	
	19,724	**13.7%**	**168**	**46.9%**	**7**	**11.7%**	**7**	**4.8%**
201-250	8,297		37		3		3	
251-300	5,222		19		1		1	
301-350	6,172		19		1		1	
351-400	5,479		15		2		2	
	25,170	**17.5%**	**90**	**25.1%**	**7**	**11.7%**	**7**	**4.8%**
401-450	4,645		11		2		4	
451-500	4,273		9		2		4	
501-550	3,124		6		1		1	
551-600	1,702		3		0		0	
	13,744	**9.5%**	**29**	**8.1%**	**5**	**8.3%**	**9**	**6.1%**
601-650	3,135		5		3		3	
651-700	4,770		7		3		5	
701-750	2,903		4		0		0	
751-800	3,064		4		0		0	
	13,872	**9.6%**	**20**	**5.6%**	**6**	**10.0%**	**8**	**5.4%**
801-850	-		0		0		0	
851-900	1,747		2		2		5	
901-950	3,665		4		1		3	
951-1000	976		1		0		0	
	6,388	**4.4%**	**7**	**2.0%**	**3**	**5.0%**	**8**	**5.4%**
1001-1050	1,024		1		0		0	
1051-1100	-		0		0		0	
1101-1150	5,638		5		2		3	
1151-1200	5,851		5		3		7	
	12,513	**8.7%**	**11**	**3.1%**	**5**	**8.3%**	**10**	**6.8%**
1201-1250	4,886		4		3		11	
1251-1300	-		0		0		0	
1301-1350	2,655		2		1		1	
1351-1400	6,943		5		4		8	
	14,484	**10.0%**	**11**	**3.1%**	**8**	**13.3%**	**20**	**13.6%**

APPENDIX C1 (cont.)

Kansas Public High School Enrollments
Including Those with NMSFs and Numbers of NMSFs

School Size	# of Students	Percent	# of Schools	Percent	With NMSFs	Percent	# of NMSFs	Percent
1401-1450	2,836		2		2		3	
1451-1500	5,924		4		3		7	
1501-1550	1,520		1		1		4	
1551-1600	3,151		2		2		7	
	13,431	**9.3%**	**9**	**2.5%**	**8**	**13.3%**	**21**	**14.3%**
1601-1650	3,265		2		1		1	
1651-1700	-		0		0		0	
1701-1750	-		0		0		0	
1751-1800	1,772		1		1		1	
	5,037	**3.5%**	**3**	**0.8%**	**2**	**3.3%**	**2**	**1.4%**
1801-1850	-		0		0		0	
1851-1900	5,624		3		2		14	
1901-1950	3,864		2		2		5	
1951-2000	3,936		2		2		18	
	13,424	**9.3%**	**7**	**2.0%**	**6**	**10.0%**	**37**	**25.2%**
2001-2050	-		0		0		0	
2051-2100	2,071		1		1		1	
2101-2150	2,141		1		1		12	
2151-2200	2,158		1		1		5	
	6,370	**4.4%**	**3**	**0.8%**	**3**	**5.0%**	**18**	**12.2%**
Total	**144,157**	**100.0%**	**358**	**100.0%**	**60**	**100.0%**	**147**	**100.0%**

Source: Kansas State Department of Education. Enrollment by Grade, Race, and Gender from the Principal's Building Report [for each high school], School Year 1998-99. Retrieved March 1999 at http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us/k12/k12org.html.

APPENDIX C2

Kansas Private High School Enrollments Including Those with NMSFs and Numbers of NMSFs

School Size	# of Students	Percent	# of Schools	Percent	With NMSFs	Percent	# of NMSFs	Percent
0-50	62		2		0		0	
51-100	176		2		0		0	
101-150	350		3		1		2	
151-200	153		1		0		0	
	741	**11.2%**	**8**	**34.8%**	**1**	**8.3%**	**2**	**10.5%**
201-300	875		4		3		3	
301-400	307		1		0		0	
401-500	452		1		0		0	
501-600	542		1		0		0	
	2,176	**32.9%**	**7**	**30.4%**	**3**	**25.0%**	**3**	**15.8%**
801-1000	2,536		3		3		6	
1001-1200	1,160		1		1		1	
	3,696	**55.9%**	**4**	**17.4%**	**4**	**33.3%**	**7**	**36.8%**
Unknown Enrollment	-		**4**	**17.4%**	**4**	**33.3%**	**7**	**36.8%**
Total	**6,613**	**100.0%**	**23**	**100.0%**	**12**	**100.0%**	**19**	**100.0%**

Source: Kansas State Department of Education. Enrollment by Grade, Race, and Gender from the Principal's Building Report [for each high school], School Year 1998-99. Retrieved March 1999 at http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us/k12/k12org.html

APPENDIX D1

Public/Private High Schools Enrolling NMSFs Grouped by Size

# Students	High School	98-99 Enrollment	NMSFs
	Cair-Paravel Latin (Topeka)*	?	2
	Hyman Brand Hebrew (Overland Park)*	?	1
	Sunrise Christian Academy (Wichita)*	?	1
	Wichita Collegiate*B67	?	3
51-100	White Rock High	68	1
	Eastern Heights High	93	1
101-150	Independent High (Wichita)*	108	2
	Meade High	139	1
	Wathena High	142	1
151-200	Moundridge High	155	1
	Wabaunsee Senior High	195	1
	Southwestern Heights High	199	1
	Trinity Catholic High (Wichita)*	222	1
201-300	Maur Hill High (Atchison)*	206	1
	Immaculata High (Leavenworth)*	228	1
	Uniontown High School	246	1
	Belle Plaine High	248	1
	Inman Junior/Senior High School	248	1
	Hesston High	288	1
301-400	Sabetha High	306	1
	Lyons High	374	1
	Hiawatha Sr High	399	1
401-500	Baldwin High	414	3
	Clay Center High	443	1
	Northeast Magnet High	469	3
	Pratt High	499	1
501-600	Anderson Co. Junior/Senior High	508	1
	Shawnee Heights Senior High	566	1
601-700	Gardner Edgerton High	632	1
	Chanute High	638	1
	Lansing High	659	2
	Ottawa Senior High	682	1
	Concordia Junior/Senior High	686	2
801-900	Kapaun Mt. Carmel Catholic High (Wichita)*	801	3
	Bishop Carroll Catholic High (Wichita)*	823	2
	Pittsburg High	872	1
	Winfield High	875	4
901-1000	Bishop Miege High (Shawnee Mission)*	912	1
	McPherson High	932	3
1001-1200	Great Bend High School	1105	1
	Hays High	1145	2

APPENDIX D1 (cont.)

Public/Private High Schools Enrolling NMSFs Grouped by Size

# Students	High School	98-99 Enrollment	NMSFs
	St. Thomas Aquinas High (Olathe)*	1160	1
	Lawrence Free State High	1163	5
	Newton Senior High	1165	1
	Salina High South	1189	1
1201-1400	Salina High Central	1208	2
	Lawrence High	1215	5
	Topeka West High	1221	4
	Olathe East Senior High	1305	1
	Maize Senior High	1373	1
	Junction City Senior High	1392	1
	Hutchinson High	1397	4
	Wichita Heights High	1398	2
1401-1600	Leavenworth Senior High	1404	2
	Dodge City High School	1432	1
	Blue Valley High	1459	5
	Washburn Rural High	1491	1
	Emporia High	1493	1
	Blue Valley North High	1520	4
	Wichita Northwest High	1559	3
	Blue Valley Northwest High	1592	4
1601-1800	Wichita North High	1618	1
	Wichita Southeast High	1772	1
1801-2000	Manhattan High School	1866	4
	Shawnee Mission South High	1872	10
	Shawnee Mission West High	1919	3
	Shawnee Mission North High	1945	2
	Shawnee Mission Northwest High	1964	2
	Shawnee Mission East High	1972	16
2001-2200	Derby High School	2071	1
	Wichita East High	2141	12
	Topeka High	2158	5

* Private School

Source: Kansas State Department of Education. Enrollment by Grade, Race, and Gender from the Principal's Building Report [for each high school], School Year 1998-99. Retrieved March 1999 at http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us/k12/k12org.html.

APPENDIX D2

Summary of Public/Private High Schools Enrolling NMSFs Grouped by Size

School Size	# Public Schools	# Private Schools	# NMSFs/Public	# NMSFs/Private
Unknown		4		7
51-100	2		2	
101-150	2	1	2	2
151-200	3	1	3	1
201-300	4	2	4	2
301-400	3		3	
401-500	4		8	
501-600	2		2	
601-700	5		7	
801-900	2	2	5	5
901-1000	1	1	3	1
1001-1200	5	1	10	1
1201-1400	8		20	
1401-1600	8		21	
1601-1800	2		2	
1801-2000	6		37	
2001-2200	3		18	
Totals	60	12	147	19

* Private School

APPENDIX E

Cost Per Student in School Districts Enrolling NMSFs

Unified School District	County	High School	NMSFs	Cost per Pupil
104 White Rock	Jewell	White Rock	1	9,352
226 Meade	Meade	Meade	1	7,204
229 Blue Valley	Johnson	Blue Valley	5	5,600
		Blue Valley North	4	
		Blue Valley Northwest	4	
231 Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch	Johnson	Gardner-Edgerton	1	4,913
233 Olathe	Johnson	Olathe East	1	5,131
235 Uniontown	Bourbon	Uniontown	1	6,061
250 Pittsburg	Crawford	Pittsburg	1	4,339
253 Emporia	Lyon	Emporia	1	4,303
259 Wichita	Sedgwick	Wichita East	12	4,795
		Wichita Heights	2	
		Wichita North	1	
		Wichita Northwest	3	
		Wichita Southeast	1	
		Wichita Northeast Magnet	3	
260 Derby	Sedgwick	Derby	1	4,001
266 Maize	Sedgwick	Maize	1	5,499
290 Ottawa	Franklin	Ottawa	1	4,265
305 Salina	Saline	Salina Central	2	4,082
		Salina South	1	
308 Hutchinson	Reno	Hutchinson	4	4,449
324 Eastern Heights	Phillips	Eastern Heights	1	7,485
329 Mill Creek Valley	Wabaunsee	Wabunsee	1	7,004
333 Concordia	Cloud	Concordia	2	5,133
348 Baldwin	Douglas	Baldwin	3	4,968
357 Belle Plain	Sumner	Belle Plain	1	5,581
365 Garnett	Anderson	Anderson County	1	5,048
373 Newton	Harvey	Newton	1	4,271
379 Clay Center	Clay	Clay Center	1	4,505
382 Pratt	Pratt	Pratt	1	4,749
383 Manhattan	Riley	Manhattan	4	4,293
406 Wathena	Doniphan	Wathena	1	6,073
409 Lyons	Rice	Lyons	1	4,408
413 Chanute	Neosho	Chanute	1	4,477
415 Hiawatha	Brown	Hiawatha	1	5,261
418 McPherson	McPherson	McPherson	3	5,278
423 Moundridge	McPherson	Moundridge	1	6,915
428 Great Bend	Bartton	Great Bend	1	4,101
437 Auburn-Washburn	Shawnee	Washburn Rural	1	4,167
441 Sabetha	Nemaha	Sabetha	1	5,989
443 Dodge City	Ford	Dodge City	1	4,305
448 Inman	McPherson	Inman	1	6,076

APPENDIX E (cont.)

Cost Per Student in School Districts Enrolling NMSFs

Unified School District	County	High School	NMSFs	Cost per Pupil
450 Shawnee Heights	Shawnee	Shawnee Heights	1	4,499
453 Leavenworth	Leavenworth	Leavenworth	2	4,132
460 Hesston	Harvey	Hesston	1	5,868
465 Winfield	Cowley	Winfield	4	4,873
469 Lansing	Leavenworth	Lansing	2	4,187
475 Geary County	Geary	Junction City	1	4,078
483 Kismet-Plains	Seward	Southwestern Heights	1	5,881
489 Hays	Ellis	Hays	2	5,114
497 Lawrence	Douglas	Lawrence High	5	5,028
		Free State	5	
501 Topeka	Shawnee	Topeka High	5	5,139
		Topeka West	4	
512 Shawnee Mission	Johnson	Shawnee Mission East	16	4,967
		Shawnee Mission North	2	
		Shawnee Mission Northwest	2	
		Shawnee Mission South	10	
		Shawnee Mission West	3	
Forty-six (46) USDs	**Sixty (60) High Schools**		**147**	

APPENDIX F

County Data Describing Per Capita Income And Educational Level

NMSF	County	per capita income in 1996	Total Persons 25 & Over	Number HS Graduates or Higher	Percent HS Graduates or Higher	Number BS Degrees or Higher	Percent BS Degrees or Higher
	Allen	17,390	9,445	7,011	73.9	1,170	12.1
1	Anderson	17,225	5,196	3,649	70.1	421	8.0
	Atchison	18,630	10,442	8,092	77.5	1,389	13.3
	Barber	18,936	3,996	3,171	78.4	516	12.0
1	Barton	21,057	19,121	14,909	77.1	2,602	12.7
1	Bourbon	17,567	9,847	7,276	73.4	1,381	13.5
1	Brown	19,966	7,347	5,757	77.8	917	11.9
	Butler	21,515	32,125	26,031	80.7	5,467	16.8
	Chase	18,930	2,084	1,624	77.6	284	13.3
	Chautauqua	14,141	3,162	2,228	69.9	335	10.0
	Cherokee	16,561	13,847	9,715	70.1	1,433	10.3
	Cheyenne	21,519	2,307	1,711	73.4	306	12.6
	Clark	21,267	1,717	1,433	82.9	300	16.9
1	Clay	20,626	6,309	4,906	77.5	836	13.1
2	Cloud	19,647	7,494	5,693	75.3	1,037	13.2
	Coffey	18,841	5,589	4,300	76.9	752	13.3
	Comanche	19,195	1,626	1,268	77.9	242	14.8
4	Cowley	18,929	23,837	18,333	76.9	3,561	14.9
1	Crawford	19,342	22,641	16,918	74.2	4,240	18.2
	Decatur	18,851	2,822	2,214	77.9	385	13.0
	Dickinson	18,397	12,731	10,146	79.2	1,517	11.4
1	Doniphan	19,017	5,167	3,774	72.8	503	9.5
13	Douglas	19,147	42,308	37,586	88.1	16,264	37.7
	Edwards	22,212	2,649	2,021	76.1	348	13.0
	Elk	17,547	2,421	1,629	67.1	253	10.2
2	Ellis	21,444	15,396	12,413	80.0	3,610	22.8
	Ellsworth	18,734	4,568	3,497	76.6	585	12.8
	Finney	19,450	18,051	12,798	70.0	2,593	13.5
1	Ford	20,741	16,197	12,411	75.7	2,935	17.2
1	Franklin	18,780	13,922	10,736	76.9	1,797	12.7
1	Geary	16,990	16,214	13,518	83.3	2,371	14.5
	Gove	20,230	2,215	1,752	78.9	302	13.4
	Graham	18,298	2,456	1,904	77.5	349	14.2
	Grant	20,148	4,116	3,093	75.1	561	13.6
	Gray	21,236	3,266	2,266	68.9	413	12.2
	Greeley	20,343	1,128	929	82.0	189	16.4
	Greenwood	16,681	5,490	4,125	74.8	569	10.0
	Hamilton	25,631	1,639	1,203	73.4	211	12.9
	Harper	18,461	4,964	3,881	78.2	540	10.9
2	Harvey	24,047	19,969	16,224	80.6	4,054	19.6
	Haskell	28,416	2,318	1,765	75.9	311	13.1
	Hodgeman	21,578	1,475	1,253	83.9	255	16.3

APPENDIX F (cont.)

County Data Describing Per Capita Income And Educational Level

NMSF	County	per capita income in 1996	Total Persons 25 & Over	Number HS Graduates or Higher	Percent HS Graduates or Higher	Number BS Degrees or Higher	Percent BS Degrees or Higher
	Jackson	21,044	7,389	5,970	80.6	768	10.2
	Jefferson	19,702	10,399	8,426	80.4	1,404	12.9
1	Jewell	21,493	3,055	2,467	80.6	357	11.5
48	Johnson	35,297	230,732	214,248	92.4	93,401	40.1
	Kearny	22,612	2,397	1,770	73.5	300	12.2
	Kingman	19,506	5,545	4,295	77.6	662	12.0
	Kiowa	19,933	2,481	1,934	77.7	362	14.4
	Labette	17,077	15,347	11,381	73.9	1,859	11.8
	Lane	20,247	1,604	1,301	81.1	285	17.8
4	Leavenworth	18,377	42,005	35,494	84.5	10,051	24.0
	Lincoln	18,441	2,637	2,047	77.0	307	10.9
	Linn	16,171	5,594	4,133	72.9	579	9.4
	Logan	19,240	2,089	1,636	77.7	333	15.4
1	Lyon	19,129	19,815	16,219	81.8	4,244	21.3
	Marion	22,431	17,413	13,617	77.6	3,032	16.8
	Marshall	17,570	8,808	6,501	73.6	1,310	14.7
5	McPherson	21,976	8,001	6,203	76.7	914	9.2
1	Meade	19,297	2,840	2,258	79.3	485	16.8
	Miami	20,269	15,144	11,885	78.0	1,997	12.6
	Mitchell	21,379	4,804	3,968	82.3	758	15.4
	Montgomery	18,174	25,490	18,602	72.5	3,464	13.1
	Morris	16,047	4,258	3,442	80.9	532	12.5
	Morton	20,923	2,148	1,629	75.5	348	15.8
1	Nemaha	22,776	6,777	5,127	75.2	832	11.9
1	Neosho	19,075	11,258	8,690	76.6	1,296	10.9
	Ness	21,446	2,808	2,190	78.0	346	12.3
	Norton	17,889	4,216	3,243	76.8	540	12.7
	Osage	17,421	10,137	7,796	76.3	945	8.7
	Osborne	21,983	3,468	2,639	76.1	380	11.0
	Ottawa	18,552	3,887	3,149	80.7	545	13.7
	Pawnee	21,048	5,116	4,198	81.8	853	16.5
1	Phillips	21,649	4,610	3,409	73.4	504	10.4
	Pottawatomie	18,035	10,068	8,233	81.3	1,567	15.1
1	Pratt	19,410	6,472	5,331	81.8	1,265	19.0
	Rawlins	19,158	2,333	1,875	80.0	336	14.0
4	Reno	21,548	41,151	31,858	77.1	6,144	14.5
	Republic	23,458	4,776	3,741	77.6	490	9.5
1	Rice	18,730	6,988	5,671	80.2	1,309	17.8
4	Riley	18,181	30,565	28,023	91.4	10,470	33.9
	Rooks	19,109	4,084	3,025	73.3	449	10.2
	Rush	18,666	2,793	2,029	71.7	321	10.6
	Russell	21,018	5,650	4,207	74.2	794	13.8
3	Saline	25,130	31,778	26,198	82.4	5,611	17.6

APPENDIX F (cont.)

County Data Describing Per Capita Income And Educational Level

NMSF	County	per capita income in 1996	Total Persons 25 & Over	Number HS Graduates or Higher	Percent HS Graduates or Higher	Number BS Degrees or Higher	Percent BS Degrees or Higher
	Scott	19,851	3,405	2,630	76.7	470	13.3
24	Sedgwick	24,038	252,868	208,452	81.7	56,119	21.4
1	Seward	21,693	10,810	7,809	71.4	1,252	10.8
11	Shawnee	23,888	104,795	88,454	84.0	23,400	21.9
	Sheridan	23,115	2,030	1,655	80.8	270	12.6
	Sherman	21,310	4,442	3,333	74.3	554	11.8
	Smith	20,685	3,769	2,788	73.6	376	9.7
	Stafford	20,489	3,640	2,864	78.0	601	15.8
	Stanton	29,513	1,406	1,081	75.9	238	16.0
	Stevens	25,455	3,155	2,472	77.9	445	13.7
1	Sumner	20,375	16,820	12,970	76.4	1,895	10.6
	Thomas	19,344	4,988	4,259	85.0	784	15.3
	Trego	20,597	2,564	1,869	72.7	309	11.8
1	Wabaunsee	20,790	4,359	3,655	83.1	548	11.8
	Wallace	17,628	1,147	892	76.8	143	11.5
	Washington	20,391	4,939	3,440	69.5	552	11.0
	Wichita	34,714	1,723	1,235	71.4	216	12.2
	Wilson	17,182	7,087	5,284	73.9	806	10.7
	Woodson	15,982	2,912	2,056	69.9	244	7.6
	Wyandotte	17,613	100,533	70,245	69.2	10,402	9.7
	KANSAS	23,133	1,565,936	1,272,664	81.2	330,377	21.1

Source: For per capital income, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, Http://www.ukans.edu/cwis/units/IPPBR/ksdata/esum/report/, May 1999.

For other data, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, 1990 Census data from *Statistics Kansas*, Volume 4.0, July 1998

APPENDIX G

1999 NMSFs Judgments of Academic Rigor

	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Elementary						
Should be more rigorous	16	32.7%	11	24.4%	27	28.7%
Should be less rigorous	33	67.3%	34	75.6%	67	71.3%
Acceptable as it is	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Subtotal	49	100.0%	45	100.0%	94	100.0%
Middle/Junior High						
Should be more rigorous	34	68.0%	31	68.9%	65	68.4%
Should be less rigorous	16	32.0%	14	31.1%	30	31.6%
Acceptable as it is	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Subtotal	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%
High School English						
Should be more rigorous	21	42.0%	11	24.4%	32	33.7%
Should be less rigorous	28	56.0%	34	75.6%	62	65.3%
Acceptable as it is	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%
Subtotal	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%
High School Foreign Language						
Should be more rigorous	21	42.0%	16	35.6%	37	38.9%
Should be less rigorous	29	58.0%	27	60.0%	56	58.9%
Acceptable as it is	0	0.0%	2	4.4%	2	2.1%
Subtotal	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%
High School Mathematics						
Should be more rigorous	11	22.0%	11	24.4%	22	23.2%
Should be less rigorous	38	76.0%	34	75.6%	72	75.8%
Acceptable as it is	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%
Subtotal	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%
High School Science						
Should be more rigorous	19	38.0%	15	33.3%	34	35.8%
Should be less rigorous	29	58.0%	30	66.7%	59	62.1%
Acceptable as it is	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.1%
Subtotal	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%
High School Social Studies						
Should be more rigorous	20	40.0%	15	33.3%	35	36.8%
Should be less rigorous	30	60.0%	29	64.4%	59	62.1%
Acceptable as it is	0	0.0%	1	2.2%	1	1.1%
Subtotal	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	95	100.0%

APPENDIX H

Quality of Facilities and Equipment Available for Student Use
Schools Enrolling Up to 400 Students (22 Respondents from 18 Schools)

Academic Facilities	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable/ Available
Library	4.5%	45.5%	40.9%	9.1%	0.0%
Science Laboratory(ies)	9.1%	59.1%	18.2%	9.1%	4.5%
Classrooms	13.6%	68.2%	13.6%	4.5%	0.0%
Band/Orchestra Room	9.1%	22.7%	45.5%	13.6%	9.1%
Choral Room	18.2%	22.7%	36.4%	9.1%	13.6%
Auditorium/Theater	27.3%	36.4%	9.1%	22.7%	4.5%
Vocational Laboratories/Classrooms	13.6%	27.3%	4.5%	9.1%	45.5%
Computers	40.9%	27.3%	22.7%	0.0%	9.1%
TOTAL AVERAGE OF PERCENTS	17.0%	38.6%	23.9%	9.7%	10.8%
Non-Academic Facilities					
Gymnasium	59.1%	31.8%	0.0%	4.5%	4.5%
Swimming Pool	4.5%	13.6%	0.0%	4.5%	77.3%
Football Field	13.6%	31.8%	9.1%	4.5%	40.9%
Baseball Field	18.2%	9.1%	13.6%	4.5%	54.5%
Soccer Field	0.0%	13.6%	4.5%	4.5%	77.3%
Track Field	13.6%	27.3%	9.1%	27.3%	22.7%
Tennis Courts	4.5%	18.2%	18.2%	4.5%	54.5%
TOTAL AVERAGE OF PERCENTS	16.2%	20.8%	7.8%	7.8%	47.4%

Quality of Facilities and Equipment Available for Student Use
Schools Enrolling 401 to 1599 Students (48 Respondents from 29 Schools)

Academic Facilities	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable/ Available
Library	16.7%	52.1%	20.8%	10.4%	0.0%
Science Laboratory(ies)	12.5%	37.5%	39.6%	6.3%	4.2%
Classrooms	8.3%	54.2%	35.4%	2.1%	0.0%
Band/Orchestra Room	10.4%	29.2%	29.2%	4.2%	27.1%
Choral Room	6.3%	22.9%	16.7%	0.0%	54.2%
Auditorium/Theater	22.9%	43.8%	10.4%	8.3%	14.6%
Vocational Laboratories/Classrooms	6.3%	18.8%	10.4%	0.0%	64.6%
Computers	29.2%	35.4%	25.0%	10.4%	0.0%
TOTAL AVERAGE OF PERCENTS	14.1%	36.7%	23.4%	5.2%	20.6%
Non-Academic Facilities					
Gymnasium	31.3%	55.8%	14.6%	2.1%	2.1%
Swimming Pool	14.6%	12.5%	2.1%	4.2%	66.7%
Football Field	18.8%	20.8%	10.4%	6.3%	43.8%
Baseball Field	12.5%	8.3%	4.2%	2.1%	72.9%
Soccer Field	8.3%	10.4%	10.4%	4.2%	66.7%
Track Field	22.9%	29.2%	10.4%	6.3%	31.3%
Tennis Courts	6.3%	18.8%	18.8%	6.3%	50.0%
TOTAL AVERAGE OF PERCENTS	16.4%	22.3%	10.1%	4.5%	47.6%

APPENDIX H (cont.)

Quality of Facilities and Equipment Available for Student Use
Schools Enrolling 1600 or more Students (25 Respondents from 8 Schools)

Academic Facilities	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable/ Available
Library	20.0%	48.0%	24.0%	8.0%	0.0%
Science Laboratory(ies)	16.0%	48.0%	32.0%	4.0%	0.0%
Classrooms	16.0%	56.0%	24.0%	4.0%	0.0%
Band/Orchestra Room	20.0%	36.0%	4.0%	0.0%	40.0%
Choral Room	16.0%	32.0%	4.0%	0.0%	48.0%
Auditorium/Theater	32.0%	44.0%	12.0%	0.0%	12.0%
Vocational Laboratories/Classrooms	4.0%	16.0%	12.0%	0.0%	68.0%
Computers	20.0%	44.0%	28.0%	4.0%	4.0%
TOTAL AVERAGE OF PERCENTS	18.0%	40.5%	17.5%	2.5%	21.5%
Non-Academic Facilities					
Gymnasium	20.0%	64.0%	8.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Swimming Pool	0.0%	52.0%	16.0%	12.0%	20.0%
Football Field	16.0%	16.0%	12.0%	20.0%	36.0%
Baseball Field	0.0%	28.0%	20.0%	8.0%	44.0%
Soccer Field	4.0%	24.0%	8.0%	8.0%	56.0%
Track Field	12.0%	48.0%	12.0%	4.0%	24.0%
Tennis Courts	16.0%	40.0%	12.0%	8.0%	24.0%
TOTAL AVERAGE OF PERCENTS	9.7%	38.9%	12.6%	9.1%	29.7%

APPENDIX I

1999 NMSFs Recommendations for Improving Schools

Academics and Curriculum Changes

- be sure that students understand material before moving on
- inspire students to excel by setting higher standards and making more challenging courses available
- more programs to reduce the drinking level
- more attention to advanced and gifted students
- fund the arts!!
- maybe a larger variety of courses
- make classes harder so that students have to exert more effort (avoid laziness)
- provide challenging courses for the gifted program
- read better books
- honors classes for foreign languages before the fifth year
- offer more advanced classes
- more emphasis on math and on application problems
- provide accelerated social science classes
- teach students to write early on
- more creative teaching styles; less lecture and more application of knowledge
- better techniques for teaching special-Ed students so that the gifted and handicapped are fully motivated
- don't teach: experience
- redesign the curriculum
- too much repetition of subject matter - I didn't feel challenged until my junior year
- try to be more rigorous so the USA can keep up with other countries; especially in foreign languages (start earlier)
- dump the SAGE program - it's useless; have more advanced classes instead
- provide increased technical literacy and job training
- stronger science department
- add harder classes
- more attention for high-end kids
- better extracurricular programs for middle school
- teachers should use class time more effectively
- have a more unified English department in grade school to better teach fundamentals
- more resources for top students, i.e., more AP classes
- more funding for the fine arts
- improve the elementary & mid-school science program
- provide for higher ability groups; don't put everyone together and pay more attention to the less intelligent
- less grade inflation

APPENDIX I (cont.)

1999 NMSFs Recommendations for Improving Schools

Facilities and Equipment

- newer sports facilities
- renovate facilities
- better technology
- replace the many outdated computers with a few up-to-date ones
- add more windows
- more computer/internet access
- improve the science labs & facilities
- more and better computer access for students
- keep technology (computers) available to all students
- improving educational facilities & resources
- better physics department
- give each school an additional 7 million for renovation & reduction of class size

Teachers' Salaries & Working Conditions

- increase pay for teachers
- hire more teachers
- pay teachers more to attract scholarly people to be teachers
- pay teachers more - higher quality teachers
- hire better teachers; fire poor ones
- use funding intelligently to improve facilities and teachers' salaries
- increase teacher salary to attract quality teachers
- better teachers
- increase teacher salary
- hire more teachers who majored in the subject they are to teach

Organizational Changes

- allow reduced schedules for seniors
- make lunch longer
- improved bus services, including zero hour & activities busses
- more separation into advanced classes
- get rid of block scheduling!!
- no more block scheduling
- co-educational
- reduce class sizes in larger schools
- improve student-to-teacher ratio

Discipline

- faculty should focus on the bigger problems, not on whether one is chewing gum
- that the majority of students not be punished for the actions of a few
- stricter disciplinary policies & enforcement
- administration should enforce the existing rules rather than make new ones

APPENDIX I (cont.)

1999 NMSFs Recommendations for Improving Schools

Athletics

- de-emphasize sports
- more emphasis on arts & less on sports

Other

- having a more open-minded attitude
- continue striving for improvement in all areas
- school paper
- more focus on stretching oneself
- more participation from students
- less infringement on human rights
- recognition of other states' accelerated students
- equal treatment/funding for all programs
- get more students involved in activities like volunteering
- allow for prayer, discussion of religious personal values
- increased parental involvement
- reinstate the idea of absolute moral standards
- better fundraising techniques and better policing of those funds
- improve administration (2 responses)

APPENDIX J

1999 NMSFs Career Choices

	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Business Executive			1		1	
Business Executive w/Engineering	1				1	
Construction Manager			1		1	
Economist			1		1	
Systems Analyst			1		1	
Business Subtotal	1	4.3%	4	14.8%	5	10.0%
Aerospace/Historian			1		1	
Architectural	1				1	
Chemical	2		1		3	
Computer			2		2	
Computer/Electrical			1		1	
Electrical	1		1		2	
General	1		1		2	
Engineering Subtotal	5	21.7%	7	25.9%	12	24.0%
High School Teacher	1		1		2	
High School Band Director			1		1	
Education Subtotal	1	4.3%	2	7.4%	3	6.0%
Actor	1				1	
Filmmaking/Graphic Design			1		1	
Musical Instrument Designer			1		1	
Symphony Conductor			1		1	
Teacher	1				1	
Fine and Applied Arts Subtotal	2	8.7%	3	11.1%	5	10.0%
Medicine	2				2	
Physician	3		1		4	
Physical Therapist	1				1	
Radiologist			1		1	
Psychiatrist			1		1	
Veterinary Medicine	1				1	
Health & Medical Science Subtotal	7	30.4%	3	11.1%	10	20.0%
Psychologist			1		1	
Trial Lawyer			1		1	
Writer/Geologist			1		1	
Humanities and Social Sciences Subtotal	0	0.0%	3	11.1%	3	6.0%
Journalist	1		1		2	
Public Relations	1				1	
Journalism Subtotal	2	8.7%	1	3.7%	3	6.0%
Biotechnology/Pharmacy	1				1	
Geophysicist			1		1	
Molecular Biologist			1		1	
Science Writer	1				1	
Science and Mathematics Subtotal	2	8.7%	2	7.4%	4	8.0%
Architect			1		1	
Astronaut	1				1	
Military			1		1	
Music Therapy	1				1	
Video Game Creator	1				1	
Other Subtotal	3	13.0%	2	7.4%	5	10.0%
Total Career Choices	23	100.0%	27	100.0%	50	100.0%

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Appendix K

1999 NATIONAL MERIT SEMIFINALISTS

A Survey of
Kansas High School Seniors
Who have Achieved the
Distinction of Becoming
National Merit Semifinalists

Survey of 1999 Kansas High School Seniors
Who are National Merit Semifinalists

1. Extra curricular activities in high school. Check all of those in which you participated.

_____School Paper	_____Yearbook	_____Student Government
_____Forensics	_____Theater/Plays	_____Student Club(s)
_____Debate	_____Band	_____Orchestra
_____Choral Group	_____Honor Society(ies)	_____Service Organization(s)

Sports: (Mark "I" for Intramural and "V" for Varsity)

_____Basketball	_____Football	_____Baseball
_____Soccer	_____Volleyball	_____Track
_____Tennis	_____Golf	_____Cross Country
_____Swimming	_____Gymnastics	_____Wrestling

Other (please list)_____

2. Extra-curricular activities in the community. Check all of those in which you participated during your high school years.
   _____4-H
   _____Boy or Girl Scouts
   _____Youth groups associated with a religious organization
   _____Community based sports programs
   Other (please list)_____

3. Leadership positions in high school (for example, editor, team captain, student government president, etc.).
   _____
   _____

4. Does your high school offer accelerated or advanced placement courses? _____Yes _____No
   If "Yes," how many? _____
   If "Yes," list those you will have completed by the time you graduate.
   _____
   _____

5. Does your high school provide opportunities to take college courses taught by college or university instructors?
   _____Yes _____No
   If "Yes," how many? _____
   If "Yes," list those you will have completed by the time you graduate.
   _____
   _____

6. Will you have earned some college credits by the time you graduate from high school?
   _____Yes _____No
   If "Yes," how many semester hours? _____

7. Did you work for pay during the school year? _____Yes _____No
   If "Yes," how many hours per week during your junior year? _____ Hours during this year? _____
   If "Yes," briefly describe the nature of your work.
   _____
   _____

8. Did you work for pay during this past summer? _____Yes _____No
   If "Yes," briefly describe the nature of your work.
   _____
   _____

9. Current cumulative high school grade point average (GPA): _____

10. Have you traveled outside the United States? _____Yes _____No
If "Yes," to what country(ies) have you traveled?
_____

11. Are you fluent in a language other than English? _____Yes _____No
If "Yes," which one(s):_____

12. Have you studied a foreign language while in high school? _____Yes _____No
If "Yes," which one(s):_____
If "Yes," for how many years:_____

13. Students are often given the grades A, B, C, D and F to denote the quality of their work. Suppose the schools that you have attended were graded in the same way. What grade would you give (check one for each school level)?

Elementary School	_____A _____B _____C _____D _____F
Middle/Junior High School	_____A _____B _____C _____D _____F
High School	_____A _____B _____C _____D _____F

14. Using the same scale again, what percent of teachers whom you have had at the various school levels would you give As, Bs, Cs, Ds and Fs?

Elementary Schools	%_____A + %_____B + %_____C + %_____D + %_____F = 100%
Middle/Junior High Schools	%_____A + %_____B + %_____C + %_____D + %_____F = 100%
High Schools	%_____A + %_____B + %_____C + %_____D + %_____F = 100%

15. As you reflect on your school experiences, how would you judge the academic rigor of your program?

a. Elementary:
_____should be more rigorous _____acceptable as it is _____ should be less rigorous

b. Middle/Junior High School:
_____should be more rigorous _____acceptable as it is _____ should be less rigorous

c. High School:
1. English:
_____should be more rigorous _____acceptable as it is _____ should be less rigorous
2. Foreign Language:
_____should be more rigorous _____acceptable as it is _____ should be less rigorous
3. Mathematics:
_____should be more rigorous _____acceptable as it is _____ should be less rigorous
4. Science:
_____should be more rigorous _____acceptable as it is _____ should be less rigorous
5. Social Studies
_____should be more rigorous _____acceptable as it is _____ should be less rigorous

16. Estimate the quality of the following facilities and equipment available for student use at your high school.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable or Available to me
Library	____	____	____	____	____
Science Laboratory(ies)	____	____	____	____	____
Classrooms	____	____	____	____	____
Band/Orchestra Room	____	____	____	____	____
Choral Room	____	____	____	____	____
Auditorium/Theater	____	____	____	____	____
Vocational Laboratories/Classrooms	____	____	____	____	____
Computers	____	____	____	____	____

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable or Available to me
Gymnasium	____	____	____	____	____
Swimming Pool	____	____	____	____	____
Football Field	____	____	____	____	____
Baseball Field	____	____	____	____	____
Soccer Field	____	____	____	____	____
Track Field	____	____	____	____	____
Tennis Courts	____	____	____	____	____

17. In some nations, students attend school as many as 240 days a year as compared to about 180 days in the United States. How would you feel about extending the school year by 30 days, making the school year about 210 days or 10 months?
    _____Favor _____Oppose _____Uncertain

18. What do you think are the biggest problems that the schools in your community face?
    _____

    _____

19. What do you think are the activities/programs that the schools in your community do the best?
    _____

    _____

20. If you were allowed to make only one recommendation for improving the schools, what would that recommendation be?
    _____

    _____

21. If there were one thing about your school that you would definitely not like to see changed, what would it be?
    _____

    _____

22. As you think about colleges and universities, please list in order of preference your first three choices where you would consider attending:
    _____ 1st choice _____ 3rd choice
    _____ 2nd choice

23. Keeping in mind your first choice universities above that you would like to attend, please check all applicable items that would indicate why you want to go there.
    _____Guidance counselors' advice
    _____Teachers' advice
    _____Relatives' wishes
    _____Friends' suggestions
    _____Religious affiliation
    _____Near home
    _____Size
    _____Graduates go to top graduate schools
    _____Graduates get good jobs
    _____Low tuition
    _____Promise of financial aid or scholarship
    _____Good academic reputation
    _____Good social life reputation
    _____ Reputation in sports
    _____Other (please list)

24. What factor(s) will determine which university you will actually attend?
    _____

    _____

25. Have you made a choice of a career? _____Yes _____No
If "Yes," what is that choice?_____
Indicate the level of certainty of your choice by circling the appropriate number on the following scale, where a "1" indicates that you are very certain and a "5" indicates that you are very uncertain. 1 2 3 4 5

26. After you graduate from college, where (which state) would you most prefer to work?_____

27. Have you been a participant in one of the Kansas Regents Honor Academics?_____Yes _____No

28. Respondent: _____ Male _____ Female

29. Respondent Date of Birth: _____

30. _____ White _____ African-American _____ Hispanic-American
_____ Asian-American _____ American Indian _____ Other

31. High School:
a. Size: ___1A ___2A ___3A ___4A ___5A ___6A
b. _____Public _____Private/Parochial

32. Parents:
a. Is your Father still living? _____Yes _____No
b. Is your Mother still living? _____Yes _____No
c. If both are still living, are they:
_____Still married to each other _____Separated _____Divorced

33. Father's occupation: _____

34. Mother's Occupation: _____

35. Indicate the highest level of education your parents have completed:

	Mother	Father
a. If less than a high school diploma, indicate grade level	_____	_____
b. High school graduate	_____	_____
c. If less than a college degree, indicate number of years in college	_____	_____
d. Associate (2 years) degree	_____	_____
e. Bachelor's (4 years) degree	_____	_____
f. Master's degree or higher	_____	_____
g. Other (please describe) _____	_____	_____

36. Do you have brothers and/or sisters?
_____Yes _____No
If "Yes," how many brothers? _____ How many sisters? _____
If "Yes," where are you in the birth order? _____Oldest _____Middle _____Youngest

37. Please estimate your family's income for 1998-1999:
_____under $29,999 _____$30,000-$49,999 _____$50,000-$69,999
_____$70,000-$89,999 _____$90,000-$109,999 _____$110,000 and over

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

The Institute for Educational Research & Public Service, School of Education, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, 66045

KANSAS

1999 NATIONAL MERIT SEMIFINALISTS:

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY ENROLLMENT CHOICES

A study conducted by

Billie D. A. Archer and Jerry D. Bailey
Institute for Educational Research & Public Service
School of Education
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

for the
Jones Institute for Educational Excellence
The Teachers College
Emporia State University
Emporia, Kansas 66801

January 2000

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in
Any form or by any means without the authors' written permission.

University Printing Services
Emporia State University
Emporia, Kansas
January 2000

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1

II. Findings 2

List of Tables

1. Colleges/Universities Chosen for Enrollment During Fall 1999 4

2. Colleges/Universities Chosen by Three or More NMSFs 6

3. Colleges/Universities Chosen for Enrollment by States 7

4. Colleges/Universities Chosen by Type 9

5. Colleges/Universities Chosen by Type and Enrollment Size 10

6. Colleges/Universities Chosen by Enrollment Size and Gender 12

7. Preferred Colleges/Universities that Became Enrollment Choices And Attainment of Finalist Status 13

I. Introduction

A follow-up study was completed to determine the colleges and universities where the 1999 NMSFs planned to enroll in the fall of 1999. In addition, this study provides related data concerning the selected institutions: the frequency with which they have been selected, their locations, their types (i.e. public or private), and their sizes. The differences in patterns between female (F) and male (M) respondents also are reported. In closing, the number of 1999 NMSFs achieving National Merit Finalist standing also is reported.

The information for this follow-up study was provided by the official of the high schools where the NMSFs graduated. During the summer of 1999, 54 of the 73 NMSFs' high schools reported the names of the colleges/universities that their NMSFs had selected to attend, and if their NMSFs had been named Finalists. As a result, this report summarizes Finalist standings and college/university matriculation plans for 132 of the 166 NMSFs in the class of 1999. Specific institutions are not known for five of the NMSFs; one chose to stay for a fourth year of high school; and one chose to attend technical school. The high schools of the remaining 34 NMSFs did not respond.

In the initial study, 95 of the 166 NMSFs completed a questionnaire during the first semester of their senior year. The following question was included in the 37 item questionnaire:

As you think about colleges and universities, please list in order of preference your first three choices where you would consider attending.

Fifty-seven of the 95 responding NMSFs (60%) listed a Kansas institution as either a first (32 or 33.7%), second (23 or 24.2%) or third (27 or 28.4%) preference. Some of the 57 NMSFs listed more than one Kansas institution among their three preferences.

One assumption underlying the original study was that students' actual choices would be different from their stated preferences. For example, a student whose three preferences were listed as Harvard, Stanford, and Yale might enroll somewhere else. An additional assumption was that the percentage of Kansas NMSFs actually enrolling in Kansas' institutions would be greater than 34.3% (57 of 166) when follow-up data were collected. Both of these assumptions were influenced by responses to the earlier 1999 NMSF survey that revealed 73.7% (57 of 95) of the respondents reported financial considerations would determine the college or university they actually attend.

When the follow-up surveys were analyzed, the data showed that 23.6%—nearly one in four—of those who had expressed preferences actually enrolled in institutions that were not among their preferences. And, a total of at least 70 of 166 NMSFs (42.2%) enrolled in Kansas institutions, an increase from the 34.3% who had previously indicated Kansas colleges/universities among their preferences. This figure could, of course, be higher as the high schools of 34 NMSFs did not respond to the follow-up survey.

II. Findings

Responding high schools indicated 125 NMSFs chose to enroll at 48 different colleges and universities distributed across 24 states and the District of Columbia. Thirty-six institutions enrolled one NMSF; four enrolled two NMSFs, and eight enrolled three or more NMSFs (Table 1). The eight institutions enrolling three or more account for 81 (64.8%) NMSFs (Table 2).

Eight different Kansas institutions enrolled 70 NMSFs (42.2%), including five Regents universities: University of Kansas–42; Kansas State University—20; Fort Hays State University—3; Wichita State University—1; and Emporia State University—1(Table 3). Forty-seven males chose Kansas institutions in contrast to 23 females.

A majority (61.6%) of the NMSFs chose public colleges or universities. Females chose private institutions (51.7%) more frequently than males (23.9%) (Table 4). Eight percent (8%) of the NMSFs (10% female and 6% male) chose institutions enrolling 2000 or fewer students, whereas 59% (45% female and 72% male) chose institutions enrolling more than 15,000 (Tables 5 and 6).

Ninety-five NMSFs responded to the survey; high schools reported enrollment data for 72 of these individuals. An analysis of college/university preferences for these 72 NMSFs with actual enrollment selections shows that 41.6% enrolled in their first choice schools, 18% in their second choice, and 16.6% in their third choice. Almost a fourth (23.6%) enrolled in colleges/universities that they did not list among their preferences (Table 7).

Finally, a NMSF must achieve Finalist status to be considered for a Merit Scholarship award. This process involves a detailed application package, endorsement and recommendation of the Semifinalist by the high school principal, presentation of a school record of course work, and confirmation of the student's earlier PSAT/NMSQT performance on the SAT I. Additional information collected includes a description of the Semifinalist's educational plans, school and community activities, and accomplishments inside and outside the classroom. Finalist standing was achieved by about 93% of NMSFs according to the National Merit Scholarship Corporation (NMSC) (Annual Report 1998-99).

The NMSC Annual Report 1998-99 shows that 163 of the 172 (94.8%) Kansas NMSFs were named Finalists. This is a higher percentage than shown by the data received from high school officials indicating that 95 of the 132 Kansas NMSFs achieved Finalist standing. One-hundred twenty-six of the 163 Finalists (77.3%) received a Merit Scholarship or Special Scholarship awards (NMSC 1998-99). Further, Kansas Finalists' ranked fourth out of the seven Big 12 states in receipt of NMSC scholarship awards: Oklahoma—89.2%; Texas—86.1%; Nebraska—84.9%; Kansas—77.3%; Missouri—68.8%; and Colorado—56.3%. Overall, Kansas NMSFs faired well in the National Merit Scholarship competition.

The table below shows sponsorship of Merit Scholarships in Kansas, the Kansas NMSFs that participated in the study, and the national Finalists data from the NMSC Annual Report 1998-99.

	Merit Scholarships Sponsored	Kansas NMSFs Enrolling	Finalists Nationally Enrolling
KSU	16	20	22
KU	84	42	101
Totals	100	62	123

Knowing how many Kansas Finalists enrolled in Kansas' institutions is beyond the scope of this study. However, it is clear that 62% of Kansas NMSFs choose to enroll in public institutions—54% in Kansas public institutions—compared to 37% of all Finalists nationally (Table 5). Why Kansas NMSFs prefer in-state public institutions is a question for future study.

Table 1. Colleges & Universities Chosen for Enrollment During Fall 1999

	State	Classification	Female	Male	Total
Arizona State University	AZ	Public	1	1	2
Baylor University	TX	Private	1		1
Benedictine College	KS	Private	1		1
Boston College	MA	Private	1	2	3
Brown University	RI	Private	1	1	2
Carleton College	MN	Private	2		2
Cleveland Insitute of Art	OH	Private		1	1
Colorado School of Mines	CO	Public	1		1
Colorado State University	CO	Public	1		1
Columbia University	NY	Private	1		1
Cornell University	NY	Private	1		1
Creighton University	NE	Private		1	1
Duke University	NC	Private	3	1	4
Emory University	GA	Private	1		1
Emporia State University	KS	Public	1		1
Fort Hays State University	KS	Public	1	2	3
Friends University	KS	Private	1		1
Georgetown University	WDC	Private	1		1
Goshen College	IN	Private	1		1
Harvard University	MA	Private	1	1	2
Iowa State University	IA	Public	1		1
Johns Hopkins University	MD	Private	1		1
Johnson County Community College	KS	Public		1	1
Kansas State University	KS	Public	6	14	20
Knox College	IL	Private		1	1
Lawrence University	WI	Private		1	1
Macalester College	MN	Private	1		1
Miami University	OH	Private/Public	1		1
New York University	NY	Private	1		1
North Central University	MN	Private		1	1
Northwestern University	IL	Private	1		1
Oberlin College	OH	Private	1		1
Princeton University	NJ	Private	1	2	3
Rice University	TX	Private	1		1

Table 1. Colleges/Universities Chosen for Enrollment During Fall 1999 (cont.)

	State	Classification	Female	Male	Total
Stanford University	CA	Private	2	1	3
United States Air Force Academy	CO	Federal		1	1
University of Evansville	IN	Private	1		1
University of Iowa	IA	Public	1		1
University of Kansas	KS	Public	13	29	42
University of Kentucky	KY	Public		1	1
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	MN	Public		1	1
University of Notre Dame	IN	Private	1		1
University of Oklahoma	OK	Public	1		1
University of Puget Sound	WA	Private	1		1
University of Southern Califorina	CA	Private	1	2	3
Washington University in St. Louis	MO	Private	1		1
Wichita State University	KS	Public		1	1
Yale University	CT	Private		1	1
TOTALS	Colleges/Universities = 48		**58**	**67**	**125**
College/University Unknown			2	3	5
Chose 4th Year of High School				1	1
Technical School				1	1
No Information			17	17	34
GRAND TOTALS			**77**	**89**	**166**

Table 2. Colleges/Universities Chosen by Three or More NMSFs

	State	Classification	Female	Male	Total
University of Kansas	KS	Public	13	29	42
Kansas State University	KS	Public	6	14	20
Duke University	NC	Private	3	1	4
Boston College	MA	Private	1	2	3
Fort Hays State University	KS	Public	1	2	3
Princeton University	NJ	Private	1	2	3
Stanford University	CA	Private	2	1	3
University of Southern Califorina	CA	Private	1	2	3
			28	53	81

Table 3. Colleges/Universities Chosen for Enrollment by States

State/Institution	State	Female	Male	Total	%
Arizona					
Arizona State University	AZ	1	1	2	1.6%
Californa					
Stanford University	CA	2	1	3	
University of Southern Californa	CA	1	2	3	
		3	3	6	4.8%
Colorado					
Colorado School of Mines	CO	1		1	
Colorado State University	CO	1		1	
United States Air Force Academy	CO		1	1	
		2	1	3	2.4%
Connecticut					
Yale University	CT		1	1	0.8%
Georgia					
Emory University	GA	1		1	0.8%
Illinois					
Knox College	IL		1	1	
Northwestern University	IL	1		1	
		1	1	2	1.6%
Indiana					
Goshen College	IN	1		1	
University of Evansville	IN	1		1	
University of Notre Dame	IN	1		1	
		3	0	3	2.4%
Iowa					
Iowa State University	IA	1		1	
University of Iowa	IA	1		1	
		2	0	2	1.6%
Kansas					
Benedictine College	KS	1		1	
Emporia State University	KS	1		1	
Fort Hays State University	KS	1	2	3	
Friends University	KS	1		1	
Johnson County Community College	KS		1	1	
Kansas State University	KS	6	14	20	
University of Kansas	KS	13	29	42	
Wichita State University	KS		1	1	
		23	47	70	56.0%
Kentucky					
University of Kentucky	KY		1	1	0.8%
Massachusetts					
Boston College	MA	1	2	3	
Harvard University	MA	1	1	2	
		2	3	5	4.0%
Maryland					
Johns Hopkins University	MD	1		1	0.8%

Table 3. Colleges/Universities Chosen for Enrollment by States (cont.)

State/Institution	State	Female	Male	Total	%
Minnesota					
Carleton College	MN	2		2	
Macalester College	MN	1		1	
North Central University formerly North Central	MN		1	1	
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	MN		1	1	
		3	2	5	4.0%
Missouri					
Washington University in St. Louis	MO	1		1	0.8%
Nebraska					
Creighton University	NE		1	1	0.8%
New Jersey					
Princeton University	NJ	1	2	3	2.4%
New York					
Columbia University	NY	1		1	
Cornell University	NY	1		1	
New York University	NY	1		1	
		3	0	3	2.4%
North Carolina					
Duke University	NC	3	1	4	3.2%
Ohio					
Cleveland Insitute of Art	OH		1	1	
Miami University	OH	1		1	
Oberlin College	OH	1		1	
		2	1	3	2.4%
Oklahoma					
University of Oklahoma	OK	1		1	0.8%
Rhode Island					
Brown University	RI	1	1	2	1.6%
Texas					
Baylor University	TX	1		1	
Rice University	TX	1		1	
		2	0	2	1.6%
Washington					
University of Puget Sound	WA	1		1	0.8%
Washington D.C.					
Georgetown University	WDC	1		1	0.8%
Wisconsin					
Lawrence University	WI		1	1	0.8%
Grand Totals		58	67	125	100.0%

Table 4. Colleges/Universities Chosen by Type

Type	Number of Institutions	Females	%	Males	%	Totals	%
Federal	1			1	1.5%	1	0.8%
Public	14	27	46.6%	50	74.6%	77	61.6%
Private/Public	1	1	1.7%		0.0%	1	0.8%
Private	32	30	51.7%	16	23.9%	46	36.8%
	48	**58**	**100.0%**	**67**	**100.0%**	**125**	**100.0%**

Table 5. Colleges/Universities Chosen by Type and Enrollment Size

	State	Type	Undergraduate Enrollment	Female	Male	Total	%
0-1,000							
Cleveland Institute of Art	OH	Private	484		1	1	
Benedictine College	KS	Private	937	1		1	
				1	1	2	1.6%
1,001-2,000							
Goshen College	IN	Private	1,030	1		1	
North Central University	MN	Private	1,070		1	1	
Columbia University	NY	Private	1,079	1		1	
Knox College	IL	Private	1,155		1	1	
Lawrence University	WI	Private	1,195		1	1	
Macalester College	MN	Private	1,758	1		1	
Carleton College	MN	Private	1,856	2		2	
				5	3	8	6.4%
2,001-5,000							
Friends University	KS	Private	2,389	1		1	
Colorado School of Mines	CO	Public	2,429	1		1	
University of Evansville	IN	Private	2,690	1		1	
University of Puget Sound	WA	Private	2,701	1		1	
Rice University	TX	Private	2,743	1		1	
Oberlin College	OH	Private	2,902	1		1	
Creighton University	NE	Private	3,500		1	1	
Johns Hopkins University	MD	Private	3,722	1		1	
United States Air Force Academy	CO	Federal	4,072		1	1	
Emporia State University	KS	Public	4,128	1		1	
Fort Hays State University	KS	Public	4,358	1	2	3	
Princeton University	NJ	Private	4,624	1	2	3	
Yale University	CT	Private	5,294		1	1	
Washington University in St. Louis	MO	Private	5,723	1		1	
Brown University	RI	Private	5,810	1	1	2	
				12	8	20	16.0%
5,001-10,000							
Georgetown University	WDC	Private	6,003	1		1	
Emory University	GA	Private	6,119	1		1	
Duke University	NC	Private	6,367	3	1	4	
Stanford University	CA	Private	6,391	2	1	3	
Harvard University	MA	Private	6,704	1	1	2	
Northwestern University	IL	Private	7,747	1		1	
University of Notre Dame	IN	Private	7,863	1		1	
Boston College	MA	Private	8,925	1	2	3	
Johnson County Community College	KS	Public	9,185		1	1	
				11	6	17	13.6%
10,001-15,000							
Wichita State University	KS	Public	10,273		1	1	
Baylor University	TX	Private	11,037	1		1	
Cornell University	NY	Private	13,411	1		1	
Miami University	OH	Private/ Public	14,714	1		1	
				3	1	4	3.2%

Table 6. Colleges/Universities Chosen based on Type and Enrollment Size (cont.)

	State	Type	Undergraduate Enrollment	Female	Male	Total	%
15,001-20,000							
University of Southern California	CA	Private	15,218	1	2	3	
University of Kentucky	KY	Public	16,743		1	1	
New York University	NY	Private	17,277	1		1	
Kansas State University	KS	Public	17,416	6	14	20	
University of Oklahoma	OK	Public	17,841	1		1	
Colorado State University	CO	Public	18,317	1		1	
University of Kansas	KS	Public	19,016	13	29	42	
University of Iowa	IA	Public	19,337	1		1	
				24	46	70	56.0%
20,001-30,000							
Iowa State University	IA	Public	21,035	1		1	
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	MN	Public	27,580		1	1	
				1	1	2	1.6%
30,000+							
Arizona State University	AZ	Public	32,310	1	1	2	1.6%
TOTALS	**Colleges/Universities = 48**			**58**	**67**	**125**	**100.0%**

Enrollment Data Source: Peterson's 4 Year Colleges 2000, 30th Edition: Princeton, New Jersey, 1999.
Peterson's 2 Year Colleges 2000, 30th Edition: Princeton, New Jersey, 1999.

Table 6: Colleges/Universities Chosen by Enrollment Size and Gender

Enrollment Size	Female	% Female	Male	% Male	Total	% Total
0 - 1,000	1	1.7%	1	1.5%	2	1.6%
1,001 - 2,000	5	8.6%	3	4.5%	8	6.4%
2,001 - 5,000	12	20.7%	8	11.9%	20	16.0%
5,001 - 10,000	11	19.0%	6	9.0%	17	13.6%
10,001 - 15,000	3	5.2%	1	1.5%	4	3.2%
15,001 - 20,000	24	41.4%	46	68.7%	70	56.0%
20,001 - 30,000	1	1.7%	1	1.5%	2	1.6%
30,000+	1	1.7%	1	1.5%	2	1.6%
	58	100.0%	67	100.0%	125	100.0%

Table 7: Preferred Colleges/Universities that Became Enrollment Choices and Attainment of Finalist Status

	Female	Named Finalist	Male	Named Finalist	Total	Total Finalists
1st Preference	18	16	12	10	30	26
2nd Preference	6	6	7	6	13	12
3rd Preference	5	4	7	7	12	11
Other	7	7	10	10	17	17
Totals	36	33	36	33	72	66

95 NMSFs responded to the original survey
72 NMSFs enrollment choices received from high schools

	Female	Named Finalist	Male	Named Finalist	Total	Total Finalists
Unknown Preference	24	20	36	9	60	29

71 NMSFs did not respond to the original survey
60 NMSFs enrollment choices received from high schools

	Female	Named Finalist	Male	Named Finalist	Total	Total Finalists
TOTALS	**60**	**53**	**72**	**42**	**132**	**95**
Percentage known NMSFs named Finalists		**88.3%**		**58.3%**		**72.0%**